

The Canadian-American

REVIEW

of Hungarian Studies

The State of Education in Hungary on
the Eve of the Battle of Mohács (1526)

L.S. DOMONKOS

Travel Reports on Hungarian
Settlements in Canada, 1905-1928

PAUL BODY

Count István Tisza and the
Preservation of the Old Order

GABOR VERMES

Horthy, Hitler and
the Hungary of 1944

PETER GOSZTONY

HONORARY EDITOR
Professor Watson Kirkconnell

EDITOR
Professor Nandor Dreisziger
Royal Military College of Canada

CORRESPONDING EDITORS

Professor Eva S. Balogh
Yale University

Professor Louis A. Fischer
McGill University

Dr. Veronika Gervers-Molnar
Royal Ontario Museum

Professor Geza Kuun
University of New Brunswick

Professor Alfonz Lengyel
Northern Kentucky State College

Professor Paul Piliš
Université du Québec

Professor Geza de Rohan
University of Western Ontario

Professor Thomas Spira
University of Prince Edward Island

Professor Philip E. Uren
Carleton University

Professor Charles Wojatsek
Bishop's University

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Dr. Eniko Molnar Basa
Dr. Paul Bódy
Professor Kalman Bognar
Professor J. J. Csonka
Dr. Peter Gosztony
Rev. Charles H. Henkey, Ph.D.
Rev. Aladar Komjathy, Ph.D.
Dr. Zoltan Mate
Professor Peter Pastor
Dr. Sandor Szilassy
Professor Bela Vardy
Dr. Paul E. Vesenyi
Dr. Ferenc Wagner

EXECUTIVE MANAGER

Dr. Ferenc Harcsar
President, HRS Inc.

Copyright © 1975 by the
Hungarian Readers' Service Inc.
All rights reserved.

ISSN 0317-204X

The *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies* is a semi-annual journal devoted to the publication of scholarly articles and reviews in all fields of Hungarian studies. Subscriptions are \$12.00 for one year and \$20.00 for two years. University students and teachers may obtain personal subscriptions for \$8.00 per annum. Correspondence regarding subscriptions should be addressed to Dr. Ferenc Harcsar, 908-1356 Meadowlands Drive East, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K2E 6K6.

The *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies* is published by the Hungarian Readers Service Inc. from membership fees and donations. Sustaining memberships in the HRS are a minimum of \$100.00 for organizations and a minimum of \$50.00 for individuals; supporting memberships are a minimum of \$50.00 for organizations and \$12.00 for individuals. Correspondence regarding membership should be addressed to Dr. Harcsar.

Statements or opinions published in the *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies* do not necessarily reflect the views of either the Hungarian Readers' Service or of the Journal's editors.

The editors of the *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies* invite the submission of articles and book reviews dealing with Hungarian studies. Manuscripts should be clearly typed on one side of 8½ x 11 inch paper, double spaced, with ample margins. Footnotes and bibliographies should follow the text on separate pages and should be double spaced. The articles should be original and should be offered exclusively to the *Review*. On style, authors should follow previous issues of the *Review* or consult the editor: Dr. N. Dreisziger, Department of History, Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, K7L 2W3.

The printing of this issue of the *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies* has been made possible through the generous financial support of the following organizations:

In Canada

the Hungarian Canadian Federation
the Hungarian World Federation of Veterans
the Szecheny Society Inc.
the Calvin Hungarian Presbyterian Church of Ottawa
the Hungarian Canadian Engineers' Association
the Hungarian Helicon Society

In the United States

the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America
the World Federation of Hungarian Veterans' Association
the Hungarian Association of International Affairs
the Hungarian School Care Club
the Hungarian United Fund (Detroit Care Club)
the United Hungarian Fund, USA
the United Hungarian Fund (San Diego Care Club)
the American Transylvanian Federation

Printed by Brown & Martin Ltd.
Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

The Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies

Honorary Editor
Watson Kirkconnell

Editor
Nandor Dreisziger

Executive Manager
Ferenc Harcsar

Corresponding Editors

Eva S. Balogh
Yale University

Paul Pilisi
Université du Québec

Louis A. Fischer
McGill University

Geza de Rohan
University of Western Ontario

Veronika Gervers-Molnar
Royal Ontario Museum

Thomas Spira
University of Prince Edward Island

Geza Kuun
University of New Brunswick

Philip E. Uren
Carleton University

Alfonz Lengyel
Northern Kentucky State College

Charles Wojatsek
Bishop's University

CONTENTS

The State of Education in Hungary on the Eve of the Battle of Mohács (1526)	3
<i>L. S. DOMONKOS</i>	
Travel Reports on Hungarian Settlements in Canada, 1905-1928 ...	21
<i>PAUL BÓDY</i>	
Count István Tisza and the Preservation of the Old Order	33
<i>GABOR VERMES</i>	
Horthy, Hitler and the Hungary of 1944	43
<i>PETER GOSZTONY</i>	
Book Reviews	59
Review of Reviews	65
Books Received	76

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

L. S. DOMONKOS, Professor of History at Youngstown State University, received his graduate training at the Mediaeval Institute of the University of Notre Dame. He was a Fulbright Scholar at the University of Vienna and has twice received grants from IREX to do research in Hungary. He is the author of several articles on Hungarian cultural history and is currently completing a major monograph on the Age of Matthias Corvinus.

PAUL BÓDY received his Ph.D. from the University of Notre Dame. He has taught at post-secondary educational institutions in the United States and Canada and has been the recipient of a number of research grants for work in East Central Europe. He is the author of several articles on Hungarian history and his book, *Joseph Eötvös and the Modernization of Hungary, 1840-1870*, has been widely acclaimed in academic circles. Presently Dr. Bódy is working on immigration and urban history.

GABOR VERMES, Assistant Professor in the Department of History, Rutgers University, received his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Stanford University. Presently he is completing a biography of Count Istvan Tisza.

PETER GOSZTONY, Director of the East European Library in Bern, Switzerland, is the author of several articles and books on recent Hungarian history. At the present he is publishing a biography of Admiral Miklos Horthy.

The State of Education in Hungary on the Eve of the Battle of Mohács (1526)*

L. S. Domonkos

1. Political and Economic Conditions 1490-1526

A number of studies have been published on various aspects of cultural and educational history in Hungary, but no work focuses on the period between the death of Matthias Corvinus in 1490, and the Battle of Mohács in 1526. Therefore, I shall attempt to fill this lacuna by focusing on the state of education in Hungary, encompassing all levels, from university training down to the village schools.

The 36 years under discussion are generally considered an age of decline and decadence in the history of Hungary, culminating in the defeat of Hungarian forces and the death of King Louis II on the battlefield of Mohács.

The decadence and decline during this period is not difficult to explain. The strong and centralized state forged by Matthias Corvinus did not survive his death, and the decline began almost immediately.¹ The designated heir of Matthias, his illegitimate son, John, was rejected by the majority of the nobility, who instead, invited the Jagellonian prince, Wladislaus II, to become their king. Wladislaus already held the throne of Bohemia, and thus, the two countries were jointly ruled. The ineffectiveness of this king increased dissensions in the already divided ranks of the Hungarian nobility. This division was manifested in the desire of the lesser nobility to maintain greater voice in the affairs of state, as they had under King Matthias, versus the attempts of the oligarchy to regain their former prominence. This clash of interests created deep political division, and constant tension. The economic state was just as unstable, for the country was on the verge of bankruptcy. The royal treasury was empty, new taxes were

* This paper was presented at the Sixteenth Century Conference in St. Louis, Missouri in October, 1974. The author would like to acknowledge the assistance of the International Research and Exchange Board (IREX) of New York and the Historical and Literary Institutes of the Hungarian Academy for supporting and aiding in his research. He would also like to acknowledge the guidance and support of Dr. A. L. Gabriel of the Mediaeval Institute of the University of Notre Dame and the financial assistance of the Graduate Research Council of Youngstown State University.

almost impossible to levy, customary sources of royal revenue fell off, and towns declined in size and wealth.² The oppression of the lower classes by the nobility became so unbearable, that, in 1514 it spawned the most bloody and extensive insurrection of the peasantry ever to occur in the history of Hungary.³ The ensuing suppression of this revolt and the subsequent imposition of perpetual serfdom upon the peasants, added to the already deep-seated division, prevented unified action against the increasingly menacing Turks.

Wladislaus's son, Louis II (1516-1526), was equally unable to unify the country under his rule, and he rode into battle with Suleiman the Magnificent at Mohács, with a small and ill-equipped army. The overwhelming defeat and subsequent death of the king left Hungary at the mercy of the Turks, the Hapsburgs and the divided nobility.⁴

2. *Hungarian University Foundations to 1526.*

The turbulence of these 36 years does not seem to be reflected in the state of education or the intellectual level of the nation. The intellectual ferment of the reign of Matthias continued to thrive, despite the decline evident in other areas. Under the rule of Matthias' successors, the center of Renaissance studies moved from the royal court to the episcopal seats and spread among the officials of the Chancery.⁵

Let us now turn to the various levels of education evident in Hungary at the turn of the 16th century and begin our discussion with the universities. While flourishing universities were solidly established in Bohemia, Poland and Austria, Hungary's efforts to do the same were invariably unsuccessful. Four attempts were made during the late Middle Ages at establishing institutions of higher learning, but after initial success, all four faltered and disappeared.

The university at Pécs (Fünfkirchen), established in 1367, seems to have been dissolved by the end of the 14th century. Some historians, with vivid imaginations, contend that several hundred students of this university fought valiantly and "died for God and country" in the Battle of Mohács. This, obviously, is pure fabrication, since no documents supporting the existence of this university exist beyond the 14th century.⁶

A second university was established at Óbuda in 1395, and the last evidence of its existence is a delegation of masters to the Council of Constance (1414-1418).⁷

Matthias Corvinus established the third university in 1465, at Pozsony (Bratislava, Pressburg). Following an auspicious start two years later, the university flourished but began to decline in 1472, following the death of its Chancellor, Archbishop Vitéz. By the 1490's, the buildings of the university were either used for storage or

were in disrepair, indicating that students and faculty had abandoned Pozsony.⁸

The last attempt in establishing an institution of higher learning is also associated with Matthias, for in 1485 he undertook steps to raise the Dominican *studium generale* of Buda to a full-fledged university. This institution never developed beyond the *Ordens Studium* common to the Dominicans, and, therefore, cannot be called a university. The General Chapter of the Dominican Order made several attempts to expand the Stadium of Buda and even ordered the transfer in 1507 of eight teachers from its school in Paris, to strengthen the school in Buda.⁹ The fact is, however, that these teachers never left Paris; thus, the *Studium Generale* in Buda continued to decline. Although scattered references to a *Studium Generale* continue to appear in the General Chapter deliberations, there is no concrete evidence that a truly viable institution of higher learning existed in Hungary on the eve of the Battle of Mohács.¹⁰

The reason for the inability of universities to flourish in Hungary are great in number. The most obvious among these seem to be the lack of sustained interest and financial support on the part of the monarchy and the upper clergy, a general lack of urbanization, and the availability of university education in neighboring countries.

3. *Hungarian Students at the Universities of Cracow and Vienna.*

The desirability of a university education was recognized early by Hungarians, and from the 13th century on, they frequented such foreign universities as Bologna and Paris in increasing numbers. Closest to the borders of Hungary were the universities of Prague, Cracow and Vienna, and, due to their proximity, they had large numbers of Hungarian students during the 15th and 16th centuries. This is particularly true of Vienna and Cracow, while the cultural influence of the university of Prague was negligible.¹¹

Fortunately, the registers of Hungarian students at Cracow have survived. A separate *bursa* was formed for the large number of Hungarian students enrolled there from the years 1493 to 1558. The records of the *bursa* and the matriculation lists of the university show, that between 1460 and 1500, 1,673 students from Hungary studied there.¹² In the first two decades of the 16th century, between 40 and 50 students from Hungary were immatriculated each year. After the Battle of Mohács, there was a dramatic decline of students, and the *bursa* was eventually forced to close, due to diminished numbers.¹³ Some of those who received degrees migrated to Vienna, but more often to the Italian universities, seeking further studies. Those who returned to Hungary after the completion of their studies at Cracow often received ecclesiastical benefices, found employment in the lower

echelons of the royal Chancery,¹⁴ or became teachers in the municipal or cathedral schools. The influence of the *bursa* was twofold, in that it played an active role in the life of the university¹⁵ and created close intellectual ties between Cracow and Hungarian centers of learning, particularly the cities of Northeastern Hungary. It was through the Hungarian *bursa* that Conrad Celtis, and other scholars, established contacts in Hungary.¹⁶

In Vienna, the number of students from Hungary was so large, that they constituted a separate nation, *Natio Hungariae*.¹⁷ From 1450, to the Battle of Mohács, the total number of students was greater than 2,900, according to the records of this nation. Here, as in Cracow, the number of students from Hungary decreased dramatically following the battle.¹⁸ The University of Vienna did, however, continue to play an important role in the cultural life of Hungary for centuries, even after the establishment of permanent institutions of higher learning in the kingdom.

4. *Italian Universities: Bologna, Padua, Ferrara.*

Because of the excellence of Italian universities as well as the close Italo-Hungarian relations since the Angevin Period, a large number of Hungarians made the journey to Italy to study at the renowned Universities of Bologna, Padua and Ferrara. While it is true that students from Hungary could be found at almost all the other centers of learning in Italy, Bologna, Padua and Ferrara were the three institutions which attracted the largest number of Hungarians in the second half of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.¹⁹ The list of those who had studied at these universities reads almost like a *Who is Who* of important ecclesiastical dignitaries, chancery officials and humanist scholars.²⁰

The relative closeness and accessibility of the great Italian universities probably relieved the pressure for the establishment of a university in Hungary. As long as students could get university degrees, mainly legal training, in Italy, the need for a local institution of higher learning was not so acute.

Of the Hungarian born Bishops and Archbishops who presided over the eleven dioceses of the kingdom between 1490 and 1526, over 60% were graduates of Italian universities. Graduates of Italian universities are also numerous among the officials of the Royal Chancery under Wladislaus and Louis II.²¹ About half of the Chancery secretaries were trained in Italy, and what is more important, they often kept in close touch with professors at their *alma mater* and with influential printers such as the Venetian Aldus Manucius.²² These ties with Italy resulted in the spread and the deepening of the humanistic influence which had begun under Matthias, and fortunately did not die with him.

Before leaving the subject of Hungarians at Italian universities, mention must also be made of the large number of mendicants, mainly Dominicans, sent by the Hungarian provinces to study in Italy. Dominicans can be found at Bologna, Padua, Naples, Siena, Pavia and Florence.²³ Franciscans can be found in far fewer numbers. The presence of large numbers of Dominicans in Italy also seems to support the previously expressed view, that the *Studium Generale* of Buda did not develop into an important center of education. Not only did it fail to meet the educational needs of the kingdom, but apparently it did not even satisfy the requirements of the Dominican Province.

Hungarian students also frequented the University of Paris, but in small numbers. The one outstanding figure of this period is Johannes Gosztonyi who arrived in Paris after attending the Universities of Vienna and Bologna. During his stay in Paris he developed a life-long friendship with the Flemish scholar, Josse van Clichtove. Upon returning to Hungary he became Bishop of Veszprém, Győr and Transylvania, and was a major promoter of Erasmian ideas.²⁴

5. *The Effects of the Lack of Hungarian Universities.*

The lack of a dynamic university within the boundaries of Hungary is an obvious source of weakness which placed the country at a disadvantage when compared to its immediate neighbors Poland, Bohemia and Austria. Yet the results of this failure are not all negative as they first may appear. Since all the universities in the Pre-Reformation period failed in Hungary, there was no alternative other than to study abroad. The result was the rise of a fairly cosmopolitan intellectual class whose members were aware of the main currents of thought of western and central Europe. Hungarian students received far more than just academic degrees at the universities they attended. Close personal friendships developed with Italian, French, German, Austrian and Polish scholars and these ties of affection and shared interest often lasted for a lifetime. Upon returning to their native land Hungarian students often found that former professors or fellow students sent their dedicated books to them.²⁵ Books for the Hungarian market were being printed in Italy, Vienna and Cracow with increasing frequency in the sixteenth century.²⁶ When Conrad Celtis came to Buda in 1497, he found a large number of enthusiastic supporters, among them Bishop Johannes Vitéz the Younger who was made head of the *Sodalitas Litteraria Danubiana* until his death in 1499.²⁷ Aside from Hungarian admirers Celtis also found Italians, Czechs and Austrians at the Hungarian court.²⁸ There seems to be no doubt that an East-Central European humanism was in full bloom and the three centers of it were Vienna, Cracow and Buda. That Buda

could compete on about equal terms with Vienna and Cracow shows that the lack of a university in Hungary was compensated by study abroad and an intense interest in the intellectual currents prevalent at the time.

6. *Cathedral and Chantry Schools 1490-1526.*

Turning our attention from University education to other forms of instruction available, let us discuss the cathedral and chantry schools. The development of cathedral and chantry schools in Hungary follows the general pattern in Western Europe. The decrees of the Third (1179), and Fourth (1215) Lateran Councils, called for the establishment of schools by the cathedral chapters so that instruction could be given to students in each diocese. How closely these orders were followed in Hungary is hard to determine, especially prior to the Tatar incursions in 1242.

During the 15th and early 16th Centuries, the fog of uncertainty lifts and some insight into the life of cathedral and chantry schools can be gained. A fairly complete list of the Canons of each of the dioceses of Hungary is available for this period and thus, allows the identification of some of the teachers. According to the statutes of the Cathedral Chapters of Várad and Zagreb the *lector* was in charge of instruction in the school.²⁹ If the *lector* did not teach, he delegated his position to a *sublector*. Also among the canons, the *cantor* and *succentor* were called upon to teach. The term *lector* or *scholasticus* were often used interchangeably as well as *rector scholae*.³⁰ Although all of the eleven Hungarian dioceses (plus Bosnia and Zagreb) show *lectors*, *sublectors*, *cantors* in their registers, still it is uncertain that schools with continuous instruction can be found at each of these cathedral seats. For the 36-year period on which we place our focus there is definite reference to schools or students in six cathedral towns and at one chantry. In the city of Eger students greeted Archbishop Bakocz on several occasions between 1493-1496 and received money for their singing. Those students who during Holy Week stood guard at the Holy Sepulcher, were also paid special fees.³¹ At the archiepiscopal seat of Esztergom a cathedral school of great fame had existed for a long time. Among its *lectors* and *cantors* are a number of outstanding men who played an important role in the ecclesiastical and intellectual life of the kingdom.³² The bishopric of Pécs had a flourishing cathedral school. This was especially true in the early years of the sixteenth century when a large number of students studied here. This cathedral school is referred to as a *scola maior*. The term *scola maior* has been translated into *Hochschule*, which in German is another name for university and thus, lead to considerable confusion. The fact is, however, that we are dealing with a cathedral school here

and under no circumstances a university.³³ The city of Várad (Grosswardein), which became a center of scholarship under Bishop Johannes Vitéz³⁴ in the mid 15th Century, continued to be an important cathedral school well into the sixteenth century. Among the notable alumni of this school was Petrus Váradi, one of the main exponents of Neo Platonism in Hungary, who ended his career as Archbishop of Kalocsa in 1501.³⁵ Another student, Nicolaus Gerendi became Bishop of Transylvania. The most famous student at Várad was Nicolaus Olah, who studied here between 1506 and 1512. Olah later became a Canon at Esztergom, Privy Chancellor and after the Battle of Mohács accompanied the widowed queen Maria to Bruxelles.³⁶ He became a friend of Erasmus and upon returning to Hungary ended his career as Archbishop of Esztergom and Primate. Olah played a major role in the history of late humanism in Hungary as well as the beginnings of the Counter-Reformation.³⁷

The cathedral school of Veszprém was the most famous of the institutions of learning in 13th Century Hungary. Some over-zealous scholars have even called it a university.³⁸ During the period 1490-1526, mention is made on several occasions of the teachers of the cathedral school.³⁹ The first mention of the cathedral school of Zagreb occurs in 1334. Almost two hundred years later, a month before the battle of Mohács, king Louis II instructed the *bán* (governor) of Dalmatia-Croatia and Slavonia to use his best judgment when dealing with the clergy and students in preparation for military emergencies.⁴⁰ After this date (July 31, 1526), there is no information on the school of Zagreb.

7. *Students and Teachers at the Cathedral and Chantry Schools.*

Scattered evidence allows us to make some generalizations about the operation of the cathedral schools. Indication is that most of the students at these schools were *clerici* and had Minor Orders. There is, however, evidence that lay students attended as well. The statutes of Esztergom indicate clearly what fees the non-clerical students had to pay.⁴¹ There are repeated references also to students singing at Mass and on other religious occasions receiving payment. Sometimes they begged for food.⁴² Students as well as teachers show up in lawsuits as well as in criminal cases. A canon from the chapter of Székesfehérvár (Stuhlweissenburg), who was teacher or *scholasticus*, asked for dispensation in 1504, for having caused the death of a woman. It appears that the pious canon was asleep when somebody woke him in the middle of the night with loud knocks on the church door. Armed with his sword he ran out, found only a woman, cursed her saying that the Devil had brought her there and in a fit of anger stabbed her in the thigh. At this point two eager students also show up and with a

shield delivered a few blows "ad partem posteriorem sui." The poor woman expired in a week.⁴³ Prohibitions against students carrying arms show up repeatedly in the documents, as do prohibitions against extravagance of dress and equipment.⁴⁴

A synod at Lőcse decreed that students (scholars) should wear long and proper attire. They should not wear gold or silver rings on their fingers. Also to be avoided in public are belts, bags, saddles with gold decorations; even Venetian copper should not be used. Their hair should be properly cut, their outer garment should be closed and red or green stocking should not be worn. In general the students are to behave decently and properly so as not to offend the sensibilities of laymen.⁴⁵ Transgressions were severely punished.

The instruction at cathedral and chantry schools followed the example of western European standards. The curriculum follows the *artes-liberales*. Once the student learned to read and write, the teacher introduced the pupils to Donatus and later to the *Docrinale* of Alexander of Villedieu, Priscianus, the *Disticha Moralia* of Cato. The preparation of the students was very similar to the preparatory teaching at Parisian Colleges.⁴⁶

Those who finished their education at a cathedral or chantry school either continued their studies at one of the neighboring universities or became parish priests in villages, towns or cities. Some received ecclesiastical benefices but were often slow in taking their Major Orders, a practice very common in late 15th - early 16th century Hungary.⁴⁷ Students who went abroad for further studies often returned to their dioceses after receiving one or more degrees and were rewarded with canonships. The number of university educated canons in this period is fairly high. Among these canons are a number of scholars, bibliophiles and art connoisseurs⁴⁸ whose role in the history of early sixteenth century humanism has not yet been adequately treated.

8. *The Schools of the Mendicant Orders*

The schools of the religious orders present a special problem. The two major mendicant orders in Hungary, the Dominicans and Franciscans, placed renewed emphasis on education in the second half of the fifteenth century. Giovanni Capistrano exhorted the Franciscans to devote more attention to the schooling of their members in his tract *De promovendo studio inter Minores Observantes*.⁴⁹ In 1454, the provincial meeting of Franciscans in Eger decried the lack of opportunity for higher education for the younger members of the order and encouraged that they be sent abroad.⁵⁰ Franciscans did frequent the University of Cracow in fairly large numbers. The Dominican province in Hungary was reorganized and reformed by the Viennese

theology professor, Leonhardus Huntepichler of Brixenthal, who undertook the task of reform after 1454 and visited the Hungarian convents on several occasions.⁵¹ As a man of great learning it is not surprising that he stressed education for members of his order and later recommended several Viennese Dominicans for the newly founded University of Pozsony.⁵² Beside the many Dominicans in Italy we know that the Hungarian province also sent some of its members to Paris and Cologne.⁵³

Exactly what type of education was available in the various convents does leave, however, a number of unanswered questions. Although documentary evidence is scarce, there seems to be no doubt that the mendicants had some excellent schools for their members. The fact that Franciscans and Dominicans frequented universities obviously implies that they had adequate preparation at the *studium particulare* of their respective convents. Another indication of their intellectual awareness is the active work of the mendicant orders in preaching and the role they played in the development of vernacular literature in Hungary in the last years of the fifteenth century and the early decades of the sixteenth.⁵⁴

Important centers of Franciscan activity where sizable schools or libraries can be found were Buda, Pest, Győngyös, Szeged and Csiksomlyó in Transylvania.⁵⁵ The major Dominican houses were at Buda, Pozsony, and Kassa.⁵⁶ Mention must also be made of the school of the Hermits of St. Augustine in Esztergom.⁵⁷

9. *The Rise of Education in the Towns and Cities.*

The increasing secularization of society in the later Middle Ages is evident in the rise of schools in the towns and cities. While urbanization in Hungary did lag behind western European standards, still a fairly large number of schools were in existence in the last decade of the 15th century and the first quarter of the sixteenth. The need for some elementary acquaintance with reading, writing, mathematics, which are obvious prerequisites for commerce and some of the trades, is the basic factor behind the rise of municipal schools. Well established schools, however, went far beyond instruction on the elementary level and many of the graduates of municipal schools found themselves at the universities, which Hungarian students frequented. The students were drawn mainly from the town itself and its immediate hinterlands although occasionally students from far away places were enrolled for instruction.⁵⁸

The teacher at the municipal schools was elected by the burghers with the consent of the parish priest. The schoolmaster was invited to the town and offered a yearly contract.⁵⁹ Since towns often competed with each other for the services of well known schoolmasters it is not

surprising that the turnover was considerable. We also know of instances where the schoolmaster returned to a university for further study. A fairly large number of teachers were already university graduates when they were hired, some had even risen to the magisterial dignity.⁶⁰ In some cases the schoolmaster had one or more assistants, *socius*, *Geselle*, *locatus*, to aid him in carrying out the task of teaching.

The towns and the schoolmaster agreed on a yearly salary which was paid according to various installment schemes, differing with each locality. The set amount the city paid was, however, supplemented by various additional payments to which the schoolmaster was entitled. First of all the parents were sometimes obliged to pay a sum for each child attending the school.⁶¹ Further income was derived from one or more of the following sources: Singing the "Salve Regina" in Church, singing on the feast of Corpus Christi, the Vigil of Christmas, Feast of St. George, and other feast days. The teacher could also receive payment for participation in processions, attendance at funerals or singing the Psalms at the Holy Sepulchre on Easter.⁶² Some of the towns also provided for firewood and in the mining town of Selmecbánya the schoolmaster received a half "haufen" of meat each week.⁶³ A short distance away, at Kőrmőczbánya, a bonus was given to the master for extra effort among the young people.⁶⁴ The pay seems rather good and holds fairly steady in our period. By mid century, however, inflation more than doubled the salaries.⁶⁵ While it is true that most schoolmasters were at least in Minor Orders, there were some who were laymen. Furthermore, those who stayed in a city or town for several years often became part of the municipal power structure. Several schoolmasters became notaries, others rose to the position of justice or became members of the city council.⁶⁶

The students either lived with their parents or roomed with strangers. In some instances we hear of students living in the school building itself.⁶⁷ Just as the schoolmaster had opportunities to get extra monies for various services, the student also could earn funds from benefactors, both from the city or from individuals. The most common way for students to receive money was to sing at Mass or during special religious devotions such as guarding the Holy Sepulchre at Eastertime. Money was also paid for students for greeting newly elected judges and city council fathers or in case the king or a powerful ecclesiastical lord passed through town. Students were paid for ringing the church bells at the opening of a fair or in warning of an approaching thunderstorm. In the Northwestern town of Sopron all students received 3 pints of wine at Christmas time.⁶⁸

10. *The Szalkai Codex and the Curriculum at Sárospatak.*

A most interesting document concerning education in the late fifteenth century is preserved at the Archepiscopal Library of Esztergom. It is a codex of 258 pages and contains six sections. This volume was used at the school of Sárospatak as a textbook and contains extensive marginal notations by its original owner Ladislaus de Szalka, who finished copying it in 1490.⁶⁹ The codex indicates that the schoolmaster was a certain Johannes de Kiswarda who had received his bachelors degree at Cracow in 1484.⁷⁰ The six sections of the codex reveal the material that Ladislaus de Szalka and his fellow students at the Sárospatak school had to master. The Szalkai codex is divided in the following way: section 1—astronomy; section 2—music theory; 3—legal studies; 4—literature poetry; 5—same; 6—letter writing. Since the sections were later bound together we do not know what other parts there might have been which were not included in the book. Both the astronomical and legal material of the codex shows “modernity”, i.e. acquaintance with the prevailing interpretations of the day. The most original part of the volume seems to be the section dealing with music.⁷¹

Ladislaus Szalkai, whose school book this volume was, had an interesting career before him. There is no indication that he ever attended a university, and although his social origins were lowly, his father was a cobbler, he rose to become Archbishop-Primate of Hungary and died on the Battlefield of Mohács. According to his own account he was a school teacher at one time, and in that capacity was always able to get women to bed down with,—quite a recommendation for a future archbishop.⁷²

11. *Level of instruction, number and location of schools.*

The Szalkai Codex shows that instruction was in Latin at the municipal schools but it is also probable that German and possibly Hungarian was also taught.⁷³ The level of excellence of at least some of the schools can be seen by the fact that a number of teachers with considerable reputation taught at these municipal schools. Andreas Gőnczi (Melczer), who had received his degree from Cracow became a much respected teacher at the school in Pest until an invitation was extended to him to become head of the school of Kassa. He left Pest, settled in Kassa, taught, became notary, judge and councilman and later married a local woman.⁷⁴ The excellence of the Kassa school also attracted the English wandering scholar and poet Leonardus Coxe, who came to Hungary by way of Cracow.⁷⁵ Another poet-scholar Valentinus Eck was schoolmaster at Bártfa in 1518.⁷⁶ It is hard to imagine that university trained men with considerable international reputations would have consented to become schoolmasters at

municipal *scolae* if the level of instruction would have been elementary. The subsequent history of many of these city schools supports this view completely. The municipal schools did become, in the next decades, an important factor in the spread of Lutheranism in Hungary and played a major role in the spread of Reformation doctrines. Schools such as the one in Bártfa under Leonardus Stöckel, who had studied at Wittenberg and knew Melanchton,⁷⁷ or the school of Sárospatak under the great pedagogue, Comenius, a century later, remained important centers of learning and religion.⁷⁸

The number of municipal schools in existence between 1490 and 1526, can be fairly well established. There is definite documentary evidence for 37 towns with school during this period as well as several references to schools either immediately before this period or after it. We also know that a number of the towns had more than one school within their walls. In 1525, there were 7 schools in Buda, 4 in Pozsony (also possibly a Jewish school), 3 in Brasso and the city of Szeged had 5 school masters.⁷⁹

Before leaving the subject of city schools one more observation must be made concerning them, i.e. their geographic location. If we examine a map of the kingdom of Hungary and indicate the location of the city schools, it becomes obvious that an overwhelming majority of them were located in the cities of north Hungary (Zips), and to a lesser degree Transylvania. The reasons for this can be briefly summarized in the following way: the weight of urbanization was in these regions; because of mining and trade these cities were still relatively rich; the closeness of Cracow both as a center of trade and learning; these cities had a large German population and were more culturally advanced than their Hungarian or Slavic neighbors.⁸⁰ Added to this is an important factor: these regions did not suffer the utter devastation the Turks inflicted on the Hungarian lowlands, therefore, records, documents and buildings have survived in Northern Hungary and part of Transylvania in far greater quantities than in Turkish occupied regions. To blame everything on the Turkish occupation, however, is historically not sound, for they were *always* the more highly developed regions of the Hungarian kingdom.

12. *The Village Schools. Conclusion.*

Finally a few comments on the village schools of Hungary. The most rudimentary education, instruction in the *Pater Noster*, the *Ave Maria* and the *Credo* took place in the villages. The instruction was provided by the parish priest and in some rare instances by a village school teacher. Attempts were also made to teach singing so that the children could more fully assist at Mass. Because of the general insignificance of village schools reference to them in documents are

not very frequent and usually are of an indirect nature.⁸¹ About six dozen village schools are mentioned in the thirty-six years between 1440 and 1526.⁸² It is most unfortunate that we have such paucity of documents dealing with the village schools. More information on this elementary level of instruction would facilitate the evaluation of the status of literacy in Hungary.

What is evident here is that an intellectual continuity remained following the death of Matthias Corvinus and that the general decline of the kingdom in all other respects is not reflected in education or culture. The disaster of Mohács, on the other hand, marks a great turning point not only in the political history, but cultural development as well. Because of the subsequent tri-partate division of the kingdom, sectarian antagonism and incessant wars, it really seemed that Hungary, in mid sixteenth century, was the stepchild of Fate.

NOTES

1. Lajos Elekes, *Rendiség és központosság a feudális államokban* [Estates and Centralization in the Feudal States], Budapest, 1963; also by the same author: "Systeme dietal des Ordres et centralisation dans les Etats feodaux," *La Renaissance et la Reformation en Pologne et en Hongrie (1450-1650)*, Budapest, 1963, pp. 331-395. György Bónis, "Recherches hongroises sur les institutions des Ordres," *Acta Historica*, 17 (1971), pp. 173-204.
2. The problems of urbanization and economic development have been treated in a number of studies in recent years, especially: Jenő Szűcs, *Városok és kézművesesség a XV századi Magyarországon* [Cities and Artisans in 15th Century Hungary], Budapest, 1955, pp. 172-179; also by the same author: "Das Stadtwesen in Ungarn im 15-17 Jh.," *La Renaissance et la Reformation en Pologne et en Hongrie, 1450-1650*, Budapest, 1963, pp. 117-119. Also see: Vera Bácskai, *Magyar mezővárosok a XV században* [Hungarian Manorial Towns in the 15th century], Budapest, 1965, pp. 20-21; 30-43; István Szabó, "La repartition de la population de la Hongrie entre les bourgades et les villages dans les années 1449-1526," *Études Historiques*, Budapest, 1960, I, pp. 359-368. On social and economic development see: László Makkai, "Die Hauptzuge der wirtschaftlichsozialen Entwicklung Ungarns im 15-17 Jh.," *Ren. Ref. en Pol. et Hong.*, pp. 33-38; cf. Erik Fügedi, "Die Aussenhandel Ungarns am Anfang des 16 Jahrhunderts," *Der Aussenhandel Ostmitteleuropas 1450-1650*, Köln-Wien, 1971, pp. 56-79. The best study on agrarian development is by: Zsigmond-Pál Pach, *Nyugat-Európai és Magyarországi agrárfejlődés a XV-XVII században* [Western European and Hungarian Agrarian Development in the XV-XVII centuries], Budapest, 1963, pp. 45-95.
3. The most recent study on the uprising is by Gábor Barta and Antal Fekete-Nagy, *Parasztháború 1514-ben* [The Peasant War of 1514], Budapest, 1973; also Gábor Barta, *1514*, Budapest, 1972. On the plight of the peasantry see: Zsigmond-Pál Pach, "Die Stellung des ungarischen Bauernkrieges von 1514 in der Agrargeschichte," *Wirtschaftliche und soziale Strukturen im saekularen Wandel: Festschrift für Wilhelm Abel*, Hannover, 1974, pp. 199-211. An excellent contemporary account was written by the poet Stephanus Taurinus entitled *Stauromachia*, edited and translated by László Geréb, Budapest, [1945?], pp. 11-84. On the leader of the rebellion and the general background also see: Sándor Marki, *Dosa György*, Budapest, 1913.

4. The battle of Mohács and its results are told by a contemporary historian Georgius Sirimiensis, *De Perditione Regni Hungarorum* (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum), edit. L. Juhász, Budapest, 1938; In Hungarian translation: György Szerémi, *Magyarország romlásáról* (Monumenta Hungarica V.), transl. L. Juhász, Budapest, 1961. Also see: László Erdélyi, *A Mohácsi vész nemzedéke* [The Generation of the Mohács Disaster] Szeged, 1941, and Imre Lukinich (ed.), *Mohácsi Emlékkönyv 1526* [Commemorative for the Battle of Mohács 1526], Budapest, 1926.
5. Loránd Szilágyi, *A Magyar királyi kancellária szerepe az államkormányzatban, 1458-1526* [The Role of the Royal Chancery in the Government of the Realm, 1458-1526], Budapest, 1930, pp. 1-24; György Bónis, *A jogtudó értelmiség a Mohács előtti Magyarországon* [The Legally Trained Intelligensia in Hungary before the Battle of Mohács], Budapest, 1971, pp. 219-244.
6. Concerning the University of Pécs, see: Jenő Ábel, *Egyetemeink a középkorban* [Our Universities in the Middle Ages], Budapest, 1881, pp. 9-17; 49-56. Remig Békefi, *A pécsi egyetem* [The University of Pécs], Budapest, 1909. Also: Andor Cszimadia (ed.), *Jubileumi Tanulmányok a Pécsi egyetem történetéből* [Studies on the Occasion of the Jubilee of the University of Pécs] Pécs, 1967. Astrik L. Gábriel, *The Medieval Universities of Pécs and Pozsony*, Frankfurt a.M., 1969, pp. 9-35, and the most recent summary: Tibor Klaniczay, "Megoldott és megoldatlan kérdések az első Magyar egyetem körül" [Solved and Unsolved Questions Concerning the First Hungarian University]. *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények*, 78 (1974), pp. 161-177.
7. For the university of Óbuda see: Konrád Heilig, "Zur Geschichte der Ältesten ungarischen Universitäten und des Magister Benedikt von Makra", *Jahrbuch des Wiener ungarischen Historischen Instituts*, 1 (1931), pp. 41-49; Herman Diener, "Zur Geschichte der Universitäts Gründungen in Alt-Ofen (1935) und Nantes (1423)", *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, 42-43 (1963), pp. 265-284; Leslie S. Domonkos, "The History of the Sigismundean Foundation of the University of Óbuda (Hungary)" *Studium Generale; Studies Offered to Astrik L. Gábriel*, University of Notre Dame, 1967, pp. 1-33.
8. On Pozsony (Pressburg, Bratislava) see: Gábriel, *Medieval Universities*, pp. 37-50; Mihály Császár, *Az Akadémia Istropolitana; Mátyás király pozsonyi egyeteme* [The Academia Istropolitana; the University of Pozsony founded by King Matthias], Pozsony, 1914; Jenő Ábel, *Egyetemeink a középkorban*, pp. 27-37; 61-83; Péter Ratkos, "Vztah Jana zo Zredny a Juraja Schonberga k univerzite Istropolitana" [The Relations of Johannes de Zredna and Georgius Schonberg to the Istropolitana University], *Humanizmus a renesancia na Slovensky v 15-16 storoci*, Bratislava, 1967, pp. 67-87. Also see my study: "The Origins of the University of Pozsony in the Fifteenth Century", *The New Review, Journal of East European History*, 9 (1969), pp. 270-289; Károly Rebro, "K Dejinam academie Istropolitany" [Concerning the Academia Istropolitana], *Slovenska Archivista*, 2 (1967), pp. 3-28.
9. Concerning the University of Buda see: Nándor Knauz, "Mátyás király budai egyeteme" [Matthias's University of Buda], *Magyar Sion*, 3 (1865), p. 71; András Harsányi, *A Domonkosrend Magyarországon a reformáció előtt* [The Dominican Order in Hungary before the Reformation], Debrecen, 1938, pp. 145-231; Leslie S. Domonkos, *A History of Three Early Hungarian Universities: Óbuda, Pozsony and Buda*, Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1966, pp. 126-174. On the assignment of the Parisian scholars to Buda see: Benedictus Reickert (ed.), *Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum Historica IX: Acta Capitolorum Generalium IV*, Rome, 1899, pp. 68-69.
10. *Mon. Ord. Praed. Hist. IX: Act. Cap. Gen. IV*, pp. 68, 115, 211, 205, 238.
11. Etienne Barta, "L'Université Charles de Prague et la Hongrie", *Revue d'histoire comparée*, 7 (1948), pp. 219-278.
12. Károly Schrauf, *Regestrum Bursae Hungarorum Cracoviensis 1493-1558*, Budapest, 1893, p. XVI; Endre Kovács, *A krakkói egyetem és a Magyar*

- művelődés: *Adalékok a Magyar-Lengyel kapcsolatok XV-XVI századi történetéhez* [The University of Cracow and Hungarian Culture: Contributions to the History of Hungarian-Polish Relations], Budapest, 1964, pp. 23-24. For an attempt to identify students from Northern Hungary at the university of Cracow, see the study of Pavel Horváth, "Studenti zo Slovenska na krakovskej univerzitet v 15. a v prvej polovizi 16. storicia" [Students from Slovakia at the University of Cracow in the 15th and first half of the 16th Centuries], *Humanizmus a renesancia na Slovensky v. 15-16 storici*, Bratislava, 1967, pp. 162-172.
13. Schrauf, *op. cit.*, p. 41 " . . . quod per ista disturbia nostre patrie pauci studiosi hanc domum incolerent, nos hac ipsa domo privare statuerant."
 14. Bónis, *Jogtudó értelmiség*, pp. 325-333.
 15. On the role of the Hungarian bursa see H. Barycz, *Historia Uniwersytetu Jagiellonskiego w epoce humanizmu* [The History of the Jagellonian University in the Age of Humanism], Cracow, 1935, p. 43; cf. Kovács, *op. cit.*, p. 79. Unfortunately, many of the Hungarian students became involved in fights at the university and the *Acta Rectoralia* is full of complaints against them. (See; *Acta Rec. I.*, nos. 1356, 1732, 2315, 2131, 2132, II: 399, 400.)
 16. Kovács, *op. cit.*, p. 79.
 17. The records of the Hungarian nation have fortunately survived and have been published: Károly Schrauf, *A bécsi egyetem Magyar nemzetének anyakönyve, 1453-1630* [The Registers of the Hungarian Nation at the University of Vienna, 1453-1630], Budapest, 1902. An attempt to identify the students from Northern Hungary who studied at Vienna is undertaken by Matus Kucera, "Studenti zo Slovenska na viedenskej univerzite do r. 1530" [Students from Slovakia at the University of Vienna to 1530], *Humanizmus a renesancia na Slovensky v. 15-16 storici*, Bratislava, 1967, pp. 173-188.
 18. Schrauf, *A bécsi egyetem*, pp. 188-191.
 19. Endre Veress, *Matricula et Acta Hungarorum in Universitatibus Italiae Studentium 1221-1864*, Budapest, 1941, pp. LIII-LX, LXXXIX, CLIII-CLV. Also by the same author: *Matricula et Acta Hungarorum in Universitate Patavina Studentium 1264-1864*, Budapest, 1915, pp. 11-28. Also see: György Bónis, "Gli scolari ungheresi di Padova alla corte degli Jagelloni", *Venezia e Ungheria nel Rinascimento*, Florence, 1973, pp. 227-244; Elda Martellozzo Forin, "Note d'Archivio sul soggiorno Padovano di studenti ungheresi, 1492-1563", *Ibid.*, pp. 245-260.
 20. Bónis, *Jogtudó értelmiség*, pp. 219-245.
 21. Bónis, *op. cit.*, pp. 333-334. Tibor Kardos, *A Magyarországi Humanizmus kora* [The Age of Humanism in Hungary], Budapest, 1955, pp. 202-227.
 22. Rabán Gerézdi, "Aldus Manutius magyar barátai" [Hungarian friends of Aldus Manutius], *Janus Pannoniustól Balassi Bálintig: Tanulmányok* [From Janus Pannonius to Bálint Balassi: Studies], Budapest, 1968, pp. 215-266.
 23. Veress, *Matricula et Acta Hung. Univ. Ital. Stud.*, (Bologna), p. 59-88; (Padua) 170-182; (Perugia) 311-314; (Florence) 329-330; (Vienna) 333-335; (Pavia) 342; (Ferrara) 377-385.
 24. Asztrik Gábel, "Gosztonyi püspök és Párizsi mestere" [Bishop Gosztonyi and his Parisian Master], *Egyetemes Philologiai közlöny*, 60 (1936), pp. 15-29.
 25. A good example of this is the Bolognese professor Philippo Beroaldo, who dedicated his edition of Apuleius' *Golden Ass* to Petrus Váradi, Archbishop of Kalácsa: Rabán Gerézdi, "A levélíró Váradi Péter" [The Letter-writer Petrus Váradi], *Pannonius-Balassi*, pp. 120-126.
 26. Jozsef Fitz, *A magyar nyomdászat, könyvkiadás és könyvkereskedelem története a Mohácsi vész előtt* [History of Hungarian Printing, Editing and Book Trade before the Battle of Mohács], Vol. I, Budapest, 1959, pp. 204-220. On the book dealers of Buda who secured volumes for the Hungarian market see: Gyula Végh, *Budai könyvárusok jelvényei 1488-1525* [The Printers' Signs of Buda Book Sellers 1488-1525], Budapest, 1923, pp.

- 6-31. On the special significance of Cracow as center of Hungarian printing; Béla Varjas "A magyar könyvkiadás kezdetei és a krakkói magyar nyelvű kiadványok" [The Beginnings of Hungarian Printing and the First Hungarian Language Editions], *Tanulmányok a Lengyel-Magyar irodalmi kapcsolatok köréből*, Budapest, 1969, pp. 79-128.
27. Sándor Fögel, *Celtis Konrád és a Magyarországi Humanisták* [Conrad Celtis and the Humanists of Hungary], Budapest, 1916, pp. 36-49; Jenő Ábel, *Magyarországi humanisták és a Dunai tudós társaság* [The Sodalitas Litteraria Danubiana and the Humanist of Hungary], Budapest, 1880, pp. 102-110. On the broader subject of ties between Vienna and Buda see: Péter Klimes, *Bécs és a Magyar Humanizmus* [Vienna and Hungarian Humanism], Budapest, 1934.
 28. Ábel, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-102; Kovács, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
 29. Vincze Bunyitai, *A váradi káptalan legrégibb statumai* [The Oldest Statutes of the Chapter of Várad], Nagyvárad, 1886, 1887. On the statutes of Zagreb see: J.B. Tkalcic, *Monumenta Historica Episcopatus Zagrebiensis*, II, Zagreb, 1874, pp. 68 ff.
 30. Remig Békefi, *A káptalani iskolák története Magyarországon 1540-ig* [The History of Cathedral Schools in Hungary until 1540], Budapest, 1910, pp. 41-42.
 31. Remig Békefi, *A népoktatás története Magyarországon 1540-ig* [The History of Popular Education until 1540], Budapest, 1914, pp. 342-344.
 32. Among the *lectors* we find Michael Kesztlöczy (1486-1497), who collected the poems of Janus Pannonius, Sigismundus Thurzo (1500), the future Bishop of Várad. Stephanus Brodarich, future Chancery official and historian was *cantor* in 1524. Békefi, *A káptalani iskolák*, pp. 99-103.
 33. Ede Petrovich, "A középkori pécsi egyetem megszűnése" [The Disappearance of the Medieval University of Pécs], *A Janus Pannonius Múzeum Évkönyve* (1966), pp. 153-170; cf. Klaniczay, "Megoldott . . .", p. 172.
 34. Vilmos Franknoi, *Vitéz János Esztergomi érsek élete* [The Life of Johannes Vitéz, Archbishop of Esztergom], Budapest, 1879, pp. 147-166. Also see my article "Archbishop Johannes Vitéz, The Father of Hungarian Humanism, *New Hungarian Quarterly*, 15 (1975), in print.
 35. Gerézdí, "Levélről, Várad", p. 141. Also: József Huszti, "Platonista törekvések Mátyás király udvarában" [Platonic Aspirations at the Court of King Matthias], *Minerva* (1924), pp. 212-214.
 36. János Horváth, *Az irodalmi műveltség megoszlása: Magyar Humanizmus* [The Division of Literary Culture: Hungarian Humanism], Budapest, 1944, pp. 237-239. See also: Tibor Klaniczay (ed.), *A Magyar irodalom története 1600-ig* [The History of Hungarian Literature to 1600], I, Budapest, 1964, pp. 281-284.
 37. Kardos, *Humanizmus kora*, pp. 314-318.
 38. See: Heinrich Denifle, *Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*, Graz, 1956, p. 413; Ábel, *Egyetemeink*, pp. 3-9; 47-49.
 39. Békefi, *A káptalani iskolák*, pp. 173-174.
 40. *Ibid.*, p. 184.
 41. *Ibid.*, p. 276.
 42. *Ibid.*, pp. 277, 285.
 43. "... cui dixit: si diabolus illam hic adduxisset, et mox cum illam in femore non leviter percussit cum duobus scholaribus . . . cum clipeo ad partem posteriorem sui corporis pluribus ictibus verberavit", *Ibid.*, p. 435.
 44. The carrying of weapons by students from Hungary was always a major problem. At universities abroad, as well as in schools at home, they insisted that weapons, especially the sword, were part of their dress.
 45. *Ibid.*, p. 410; cf. László Zolnai, *Ünnep és hétköznap a középkori Budán* [Feastday and Everyday in Medieval Buda] Budapest, 1969, p. 172.
 46. Asztrik Gábiel, "Preparatory teaching in the Parisian Colleges during the

- Fourteenth Century", *Garlandia: Studies in the History of the Medieval University*, Frankfurt a.M., 1969, pp. 97-124.
47. Elemér Mályusz, *Egyházi társadalom a középkori Magyarországon* [Ecclesiastical Society in Medieval Hungary], Budapest, 1971, pp. 171-173.
 48. See my article "Ecclesiastical Patronage as a Factor in the Hungarian Renaissance". *New Review of East European History*. 14 (1974), pp. 100-116.
 49. Ödön Bölcskey, Capistránói Szent János élete és kora [The life and Times of Saint John Capistrano], Vol. III, Budapest, 1924, p. 325.
 50. Arnold Magyar, "Die Ungarischen Reformstatuten des Fabian Ingali aus dem Jahre 1454. Vorgeschichte und Auswirkungen der Statuten", *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, (1971), pp. 99-100. The previous interpretation of this reform was inaccurate: János Karácsonyi, *Szent Ferenc rendjének története Magyarországon 1710-ig* [The History of the Order of St. Francis in Hungary to 1710], Vol. I, Budapest, 1922, p. 64.
 51. Isnard W. Frank, "Leonhard Huntpichler O.P. (+ 1478). Theologie-professor und Ordensreformer in Wien", *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 36 (1966) pp. 338-340.
 52. Isnard W. Frank, "Das Gutachten eines Wiener Dominikaners für die Universität Pressburg aus dem Jahre 1467", *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung*, 16 (1967), pp. 418-439.
 53. Béla Iványi, "Bilder aus der Vergangenheit der Ungarischen Dominikanerprovinz", *Melanges Mandonnet*, II, Paris, 1930, pp. 455-456.
 54. János Horváth, *A Magyar irodalmi műveltség kezdetei - Szent Istvántól Mohácsig* [The Beginnings of Hungarian Literacy from St. Stephen to Mohács], Budapest, 1944, pp. 120-125; 201-238. Klaniczay (ed.), *Irodalom történet*, pp. 138-145 particularly on preaching of Pelbart of Temesvár and Oswat of Laska.
 55. Karácsonyi, *op. cit.*, II, p. 19-22; 26-27; 59-60; 160-163; 137-139.
 56. Iványi, *op. cit.*, p. 453; Harsányi, *op. cit.*, pp. 145 ff.
 57. Ferenc Fallenbüchl, *Az Ágostonrendiek Magyarországon* [The Hermits of St. Augustine in Hungary], Budapest, 1943, pp. 58-59.
 58. Békefi, *Népoktatás*, p. 35.
 59. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
 60. *Ibid.*, p. 102 (Magister Steynhofer), pp. 110-111 (Masters at Kassa).
 61. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
 62. *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33.
 63. *Ibid.*, pp. 33, 153.
 64. *Ibid.*, pp. 33, 125-126.
 65. *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.
 66. The career of Andreas Melczer Gonczy who settled in the city of Kassa is a fine example of this. See *ibid.*, note 74.
 67. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
 68. *Ibid.*, pp. 36-37, 159, 389.
 69. The book is at the Archbishopal Library: Mss II. 395. For a full description of the codex see: István Genthon, *Magyarország műemlékei topográfiaja* [The Topography of Historical Monuments in Hungary], I, Esztergom, Budapest, 1948, pp. 306-308. Cf. István Mészáros, *A Szalkai kódex és a XV. század végi Sárospataki iskola* [The Szalkai codex and the School of Sárospatak at the end of the 15th century], Budapest, 1972, pp. 11.
 70. In the fall semester of 1481, he entered the University of Cracow; "Johannes Petri Pelificis Kyswarda". See Adam Chmiel, *Album Studiosorum Universitatis Cracoviensis*, I, Cracow., 1881, p. 250. Among the list of Bachelors in September of 1484: Josephus Muczkowski (ed.), *Statuta nec non Liber Promotionum philosophorum ordinis in Universitate studiorum Jagellonica ab anno 1402 and annum 1849*, Cracow, 1849, p. 91.
 71. Mészáros, *op. cit.*, pp. 169-198.
 72. According to the anecdotal account of Szerémi *De perditione*, p. 101, Archbishop Szalkai was the main instigator of action against the Turks before the

- Battle of Mohács. To show his bravery and resourcefulness he told the king, "when I was a student and the rector of the school, I was always able to get bed partners, with the help of my sword, from the herdsmen. Even when I was outnumbered, sometimes there were twelve of them, I was always able to get her."
73. On the problem of Hungarian instruction in schools see: István Mészáros, "Magyar nyelvű iskolai oktatásunk 15. századi kezdetei" [The Beginnings of Instruction in the Hungarian Language in the 15th Century], *Magyar Pedagogia*, 4 (1964), pp. 213-228; also: Békefi, *Népoktatás*, pp. 40-41. Of special interest is a school book written by Sebald Heyden entitled *Formulae Puerilium Colloquiorum* published in Strassburg in 1528. This work, which had paralleled dialogues in Latin and German, was expanded to quadrilingual by adding Polish and Hungarian in 1531. See: Lajos Dézsi, "Heyden Sebald gyermeki beszélgetéseinek latin-magyar szövege 1531-ből" [The Latin-Hungarian Texts of Sebald Heyden's Elementary Conversations from 1531], *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények*, 7 (1897), pp. 55-60.
 74. Békefi, *Népoktatás*, pp. 111-113.
 75. Kovács, pp. 91f. Cox had attended the Universities of Cambridge, Oxford and Paris before arriving at Cracow in 1518. On his career see the article by Thompson Cooper in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, London, 1908, Vol. IV, pp. 1336-1337.
 76. Kovács, *op. cit.*, pp. 86-90. Even while in Hungary, Eck continued to visit Cracow and had his books printed there.
 77. Békefi, *Népoktatás*, pp. 68-69; 73-83.
 78. For the impact of Comenius in Sárospatak see the studies in: Éva Földes-István Mészáros, *Comenius and Hungary*, Budapest, 1973. Also Endre Kovács (ed.), *Comenius Magyarországon-Comenius Sárospatakon írt műveiből* [Comenius in Hungary - From the Works of Comenius written in Hungary], Budapest, 1970.
 79. Békefi, *Népoktatás*, pp. 48-49, 50-51.
 80. Some of the richest municipal libraries and archives as well as the finest Gothic and Renaissance building could be found in Northeastern Hungary (Zips), now part of Slovakia.
 81. Endre Ivánka, "Iskolázás és népművelés" [Schooling and public instruction], *Magyar Művelődéstörténet: Magyar renaissance* [The History of Hungarian Culture; Hungarian Renaissance], II. Budapest, [1940], p. 439.
 82. Békefi, *Népoktatás*, pp. 461-482, puts the number of village and municipal schools at 130. See also Ivánka, *op. cit.*, p. 439, who places the number of schools in Hungary at the end of the 15th Century at about 150.

Travel Reports on Hungarian Settlements In Canada, 1905-1928*

Paul Bódy

Historical investigations of early Hungarian settlements in Canada have made relatively little use of a valuable contemporary source: reports by travellers who have observed early immigrant life and recorded their impressions. This paper seeks to illustrate the richness and value of these sources by commenting on the most noteworthy travel reports on Hungarian settlements.

The first published commentary and also the most significant report on the early Hungarian settlements is contained in the travel notes of Reverend Peter A. Vay.¹ The author was a high-ranking church dignitary (apostolic protonary and titular bishop), a missionary, and a noted interpreter of Oriental art who had visited China, Korea, Japan, Siberia and North America. Vay's general background and, especially, his broad knowledge of Asiatic and American cultures, make him a qualified commentator not only on immigrant settlements but also on Canadian society in 1905, the time of his visit to the young dominion. What makes Vay's travel notes even more useful and interesting is their spontaneous and unfinished form: his report consists of personal comments and reflections recorded during his journey. These notes and observations provide many insights into the lives of immigrants to Canada and serve as a suggestive commentary on Canadian social and political life at the turn of the century.

On arrival in Canada, Vay paid brief visits to Quebec City and Montreal. From here he proceeded to Ottawa where he was received by notables of Canadian public life including Governor General Lord Grey, Prime Minister Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

In the Canadian capital Vay had hoped to obtain information concerning the Hungarian settlements of Western Canada, but his inquiries apparently yielded no definite results. He was advised to go

* The preparation of this article was made possible through a research grant from the International Research and Exchanges Board, New York City.

on to Winnipeg where he would find the necessary directions. Vay's own explanation of this remarkable situation best conveys the state of knowledge in Ottawa concerning Hungarian immigrants:

From Ottawa I struck out to the prairies in order to visit the Hungarians. No one could give me definite information. I was told merely that in Winnipeg I would receive further assistance. Therefore I went on to Winnipeg. The journey lasted two days and two nights with the Canadian Pacific.²

On his arrival in Winnipeg, Vay was greeted by a crowd of several hundred flag-waving and cheering Hungarians. He made good use of his stay in this growing centre of immigrant life in Canada. As the Archbishop's guest, he visited religious, cultural and social institutions and managed to obtain information on the Hungarian community of Winnipeg. He also attended receptions given by Sir Daniel H. Macmillan, the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, and by the Manitoba Club. Vay's contacts provided him with excellent opportunities for gaining valuable glimpses into Canadian social and political life as the following remarks on his visit to the Manitoba Club suggest:

...the Manitoba Club sponsored a reception. I was frankly surprised to see this tastefully constructed and well-appointed building. It impressed me in every respect as a first-class club. The members were of serious bearing and well-mannered. As I noted, this is considered important and considerable efforts are made to create a cultured English impression.

No doubt, English influence is on the decline in Canada. English domination has ended a long time ago. The citizens of Canada consider their country a sovereign nation. Even more dangerous is the fact that the influence of the United States is gaining ground everywhere. Especially in the Western provinces, people, institutions, and ideas are characterized by Yankee traits.³

During his Winnipeg visit, Reverend Vay received detailed information on the location of the oldest Hungarian settlements in Saskatchewan. His main purpose had been to visit these communities. From Winnipeg Vay travelled to Kaposvar and Esterhazy, the two main centres of Hungarian settlement in the Canadian West. There he was received with joy by the local settlers as the first Hungarian clergyman to visit them. The event was celebrated with traditional religious ceremonies and community festivities. It was attended by local residents as well as settlers from the more distant, newer Hungarian settlements. Reverend Vay had ample opportunities to obtain information on the situation of the Hungarian colonists of Saskatchewan. Following his visit to Esterhazy and Kaposvar, he spent some time in the more recently established Hungarian communities north of Regina.

Vay's impression of the Hungarian colonies are highly interesting. In his view, the settlements were prosperous and

successful pioneer communities. He recognized that their general well-being was the accomplishment of those settlers who had come to Canada since the mid-1880's and had transformed the wild prairies into prosperous farming communities through years of persistence and strenuous effort. The hardships that the early colonists had faced throughout the years had been rewarded through the establishment of prosperous communities. According to Vay, a sense of satisfaction and achievement characterized the general attitude of the Hungarian settlers.

Reverend Vay also commented on the process of assimilation which he saw taking place among the immigrants of the Canadian West. He believed that the establishment of successful farming communities was an essential part of the transformation of newcomers from Central and Eastern Europe into Canadian citizens. According to him this transformation was especially evident in the change of personal values and psychological attitudes of the immigrants. Vay saw a difference in the speed with which the process of Canadianization worked among the various ethnic groups. He thought that Slavic and German immigrants adapted to Canadian ways more rapidly than Hungarians who tended to cling to their language and customs longer. At the same time Vay observed that second-generation Hungarians had generally adopted Canadian habits and attitudes.

Reverend Vay's travel notes also provide interesting information on Hungarian miners and construction workers in Canada at the time of his visit. He had visited Lethbridge and the Crow's-nest Pass area of Alberta where many Hungarians worked in local coal-mines. In Lethbridge, the Hungarian miners were generally satisfied, but in the Crow's-nest Pass region the situation was different. There, working conditions were unsafe, mine accidents frequent, and the immigrant workers dissatisfied and disillusioned. Vay's comments on this region are reminiscent of reports on industrial conditions in nineteenth century England:

Even if no explosions take place, the region is dark and mournful. Bleak. I have never seen a darker, bleaker region. The shafts are placed along the narrow ridge, chimney after chimney...all vomiting black suffocating smoke. Our unfortunate emigrated compatriots! They feel deeply the bleak atmosphere of this saddening landscape. They are full of complaints. But what can they do? Here they have earnings to secure their living. They would gladly return home at any time . . . But none of them will ever return . . .⁴

A brief visit to Niagara Falls gave Vay another glimpse of the life of Hungarian workers in Canada. Near the famous cataract, Hungarian immigrants were employed in the construction of a hydro-electric power station. Here, too, accidents were frequent

among the workers, most of whom were involved in dangerous tunnelling and underground blasting operations.

Aside from these and other sketches of Hungarian immigrant life, Vay's travel notes contain reflections on Canada. An entire chapter of his work is devoted to an analysis of political and social developments in the country. As the most dramatic feature of the young dominion he singled out the construction of a national railway system which in turn was making the colonization of Western Canada possible. In discussing the Canadian settler, Vay made an interesting observation. He felt that Canadian pioneer's outlook on life was an important ingredient of the emerging Canadian cultural and social milieu. This outlook Vay defined as a dedication to the settlement of Canada and an awareness of the value of the European heritage. He considered this attitude a sharp contrast to the unbridled materialism of the United States and a promising foundation for the development of Canadian culture. But Vay was aware of the dangers inherent in the influx of large masses of immigrants to the Canadian West. His impressions of Canadian society and his feelings of apprehension regarding the continued survival and growth of a distinct Canadian culture are conveyed by the following passage:

Cultural development in Canada follows the traditions of England and not those of America Man has not yet completely become a machine, life does not exclusively mean drudgery. The distribution of work and leisure is more proportional. And above all, the value of gold is not as overestimated, the struggle for money not yet desperate.

In short, the moral aspects of life are not yet completely sacrificed to material purposes. Feelings are not completely destroyed by the struggle for existence, or more correctly for well-being. The family, the home, the nation are still ideals of happiness. Love, responsibility, loyalty are still influential.

The continuously increasing immigration and rapid development make the preservation of high ideas and ideals difficult. The danger is especially acute that among the mixed populations of the Western territories the old traditions and social customs will not flourish to the extent that they do in the Eastern provinces. Briefly, I mean the danger that the so-called Americanism or materialism will conquer the new generation.⁵

Another highly interesting report on the early settlers can be found in the public reports and unpublished papers of Ferenc Hoffmann. The author was a professor of economics at the Agricultural Academy of Kassa whom the Hungarian Ministry of Agriculture had sent to North America to study agricultural and horticultural technology. His first trip was to the United States and Mexico in 1907. His second, lasting from March, 1909 to June, 1910, was devoted completely to Canada. Hoffmann's unpublished reports and published articles are based on the impressions and information he gained during his visits.⁶

Of primary interest to the present discussion is his Canadian trip and his recorded observations. In the initial phase of his Canadian visit he established contacts with leading authorities in the field of agriculture in Montreal and Ottawa. He visited the Macdonald Agricultural Academy in St. Anne de Bellevue near Montreal and received detailed information from its director, I.W. Robertson. He also made the acquaintance of G.T. Bell, a member of the board of the Grand Trunk Railway System. In Ottawa he received assistance from the Federal Minister of Agriculture, Sydney Fisher, and William Saunders, the Director of the Central Experimental Farm. These contacts not only provided him with information on Canadian agricultural technology, but facilitated the second important purpose of his trip: the study of Hungarian settlements in Western Canada.⁷

Ferenc Hoffmann first encountered Hungarian immigrants in Winnipeg, where he observed the arrival and settlement of new immigrants. His observations are summarized in an article published in Hungary following his return.⁸ Noteworthy is the author's vivid description of scenes of Hungarian immigrants arriving at Immigrant Hall. Hoffmann also gave an account of the immigrants' first Canadian impressions. In the course of their journey via CPR trains to Winnipeg, they noted the practicality of kitchen facilities and adjustable sleeping beds. On arrival, they were escorted into temporary quarters in Immigration Hall and offered warm showers and meals cooked by native Hungarian peasant chefs. All this made a profound impression on peasants who were not at all accustomed to such treatment. In another observation the author referred to the instinctive tendency of new arrivals to remain attached to fellow-immigrants hailing from their native village or nearby districts. Hoffmann interpreted this behaviour as a natural defense mechanism of the peasant immigrant in the face of the strange Canadian society. Furthermore, he noted, this pattern of association generally formed the basis of group settlements on the Saskatchewan prairies, not only because of the importance of relating to a familiar community, but also because frequently immigrants coming from a certain region of Hungary had similar social-economic status. Thus immigrants from northeastern Hungary were generally destitute, while those from western and southern Hungary possessed modest financial resources.

Perhaps the most interesting point of Hoffmann's report is the discussion of Hungarian immigrant settlement.⁹ He noted two general types of settlement. The first was homestead farming on the Saskatchewan plains. This course was open to those who possessed financial resources sufficient for the purchase of farm implements and farm animals. The second was the occupation of forested homesteads, usually near Winnipeg, where forest clearing provided basic main-

tenance until such time as the capital required for homestead farming was in hand. Those lacking financial resources usually chose this course. Hoffmann noted that the majority of newcomers belonged to this group.

The first type of settlement usually evolved in the following manner. After the selection of a homestead, a rudimentary shelter was built: a large tent, mud or wooden structure. Later permanent farm buildings were erected. Since no significant income could be expected in the first three years, the settler and his family sought employment in nearby towns during the winter. After the first three years of farming, the homestead was usually well-developed and provided sufficient income for the maintenance of the family.

The second type was quite different. The settler, having no funds of his own, first had to obtain temporary employment in Winnipeg through the assistance of the immigration office. From his earnings he purchased the bare necessities which enabled him to occupy a forested homestead. These included a pair of axes, a saw, food for five or six days and a railway ticket to his destination, usually Spurgo or Woodridge. After his arrival, he selected an available homestead and began clearing the forest. Usually he shipped lumber to Winnipeg, but he could also sell it to the local merchant, who made handsome profits on the transaction. As the forest was cleared, an area was prepared for planting. Initially garden vegetables were planted, later they were replaced with grain. Poultry and other farm animals were kept. Fishing and hunting of caribou and moose provided supplementary sources of income.

Hoffmann reported that, although the second type of settlement did provide basic maintenance, the settler was easily discouraged by the slow progress made in clearing the land. As a result, it was a frequent practice to sell these homesteads after three years of occupancy. These sales constituted, in effect, the real earnings of the homestead farmer for three years of hard work. Comparing the average sale price of these homesteads with the average earnings of industrial workers in the United States, the author concluded that the Canadian immigrant was generally better off than an American immigrant worker. Consequently, argued Hoffmann, the Hungarian immigrant to Canada ought to be considered as a temporary resident, comparable to the immigrants in the United States who intended to return to Hungary after saving a certain amount of money.

Another point related by Hoffmann is an account of his conversations with J. Bruce Walker, the Commissioner of Immigration in Winnipeg. The Canadian official was favorably impressed with the ability of the Hungarian immigrant to adjust to the simplicities of pioneer life. Walker explained to his visitor that the Hungarian

immigrant was especially adept in bearing the hardships of homestead settlement. He also stressed the ability of immigrants to organize a traditional way of life within the confines of a farm and home constructed by themselves. Hungarian settlers, furthermore, were known in Western Canada for their strong attachment to the land. Finally, the Commissioner praised Hungarian immigrants for their judgement and knowledge of land suitable for farming. On the latter point Walker's comments are worth quoting:

He examines the soil by touring the forests and prairies for days and weeks, testing soil conditions. He observes the location of trees and the condition of haygrass. He seeks out gentle slopes to facilitate the flow of water. He prefers areas with air passage, especially in forested areas, because they decrease the danger of frost. Because of these extraordinary perceptions of farming, Hungarian settlers are frequently chosen as guides of new colonists.¹⁰

The Commissioner of Immigration also had some critical comments on the Hungarian immigrant. He thought that Hungarians were strongly attached to native customs and resisted the adoption of Canadian ways. As a result of these attitudes, the Hungarian immigrant made very slow progress in learning English. The Commissioner added that the Canadian government wished to assist the immigrant in spite of these objectionable traits. Such assistance took the form of reduced rail fares, emergency relief, lumber grants from crownlands, job assistance and free medical care. This policy was designed to foster confidence between the immigrant and the Canadian government. In the words of the Commissioner: "The nearer the government comes to the immigrant, the nearer the immigrant comes to the government. It makes him a better citizen."

Hoffman generally agreed with this assessment of the Hungarian peasant immigrant. In his view, the Hungarian peasant continued his traditional way of life in Canada. In the new environment he constructed log houses covered by a thatched or wooden roof. His family wore clothing traditionally worn in Hungary. New winter clothing was prepared from furs obtained through hunting in Canada. Food was prepared essentially in the Hungarian style, with the exception that tea and coffee were now consumed in great quantities. Such a life-style seemed simple in contrast to modern Canadian customs, but for the Hungarian peasant it represented an advantageous blend of Hungarian tradition and Canadian economic opportunity. Concerning the traditional attitudes of the Hungarian immigrant Hoffmann remarked that immigrants who came to Canada directly from Hungary exhibited a very strong attachment to traditions. He noted that the acquisition of the English language was naturally difficult given the circumstances of pioneer life. He

mentioned two specific causes of the Hungarian immigrants' indifference to Canadian society: first, the lack of adequate religious leadership and pastoral care for the Hungarian communities, and second, the fact that more Hungarian immigrants planned to return to Hungary after several years of Canadian residence.¹¹ His assessment of this question is summarized in the following manner:

Settlers coming from the old country will always remain strangers to Canadian society. Children of school age learn English in Canadian schools. Even in Hungarian communities no more than two hours per week of Hungarian language instruction are available. These include the townships of Otthon, Bekevar, Kaposvar, Esterhazy, Szekefold, Matyasfold, Howell and Estevan. In mixed settlements children can learn Hungarian only at the expense of their parents. In the family, Hungarian is spoken at all times, but in mixed settlements English is used outside the family circle.¹²

These brief references to the Canadian reports of Ferenc Hoffmann illustrate their value as source materials on Hungarian immigrant life. They are particularly interesting as evaluations of the social attitudes of Hungarian immigrants at the time of their entry into Canadian society. In addition, they provide a contemporary viewpoint on the complex process of transition from traditional European society to modernized Canadian ways. It would be therefore desirable to make the unpublished reports of Ferenc Hoffmann available to researchers in the field of immigration and ethnic history.

The third report on Hungarians in Canada to be discussed in this paper is the comprehensive travel commentary of the Hungarian journalist, Ödön Paizs.¹³ The author had toured Canada in 1928 with the specific purpose of discovering and reporting on the Canadian-Hungarian communities. The publication can best be described as a high-quality journalistic report of Hungarian immigrant life in 1928. Its value as an historical record can be seen in its portrayal of Hungarian immigrants at a critical stage of the history of Canadian immigration: at a time when agrarian settlements had already reached their peak and the beginnings of urban immigrant life could be observed. The report focuses on those issues which played prominent roles for Hungarian immigrants at that date: the stability of the established Western settlements, the transience of urban immigrants and the attitudes of the Canadian government toward these highly disparate segments of immigrant society.

The most important theme of the author is the early phase of urban life among Hungarian immigrants in Canada. The clarification of this complex social process required in the first place an assessment of the predominantly rural Hungarian settlements and their role in subsequent urbanization. According to Paizs, Hungarian immigrants in 1928 were predominantly residents of rural Saskatchewan. Only a

fraction of Hungarians were urbanized and settlement outside of Saskatchewan was insignificant and of recent origin. In view of the concentration of Hungarian immigrants in Western Canada, the towns and cities located in the West became the earliest centres of Hungarian urban life. Paizs discussed especially the roles of Winnipeg and Lethbridge as immigrant urban centres. He noted that Hungarian settlement in Winnipeg dated back to the turn of the century. Nevertheless a permanent Hungarian community emerged only after 1925. The author considered important in this respect the formation of Hungarian community organizations, Hungarian churches and of a small group of urban professionals of Hungarian descent. In spite of these encouraging signs of an immigrant urban population, however, the author remarked that Winnipeg's Hungarian population belongs essentially to an unstable, transient labour force seeking employment or moving on to other regions. Winnipeg was therefore primarily a transit station for Hungarians in 1928.

Lethbridge had also been an established centre of Hungarian immigrants. The first to settle there were miners, previously employed in Eastern United States mines, who, according to Paizs' information, arrived in Lethbridge in 1893. Later, others joined them and obtained employment in the coal mines. At the time of the report, the Lethbridge Hungarian community numbered about 100 families. Lethbridge constituted, however, not so much an urban centre, but primarily an industrial concentration located in a rural environment. As a result, no significant urbanization or population growth was expected there.

More important as potential urban immigrant centres were the cities of Eastern Canada. But in 1928 only the beginnings of an urban immigrant population could be observed here as well. Toronto, according to the Hungarian report, was a transit station for Hungarian immigrants. Only a very small group of permanently established merchants, tradesmen or workers of Hungarian descent resided in the city. Oshawa offered employment to a small group of skilled automobile workers. Paizs considered Hamilton the real centre of Hungarian urban life in Eastern Canada. At the time of his visit approximately 1,500 Hungarians lived there. The core of the Hungarian population was a substantial group of skilled and unskilled workers. Furthermore, an active social and cultural life flourished among Hungarian immigrants. The author noted particularly the roles of musical and literary programs, the presence of Hungarian community groups and the sponsorship of English language classes for immigrants. Significantly, one of the two Hungarian newspapers in Canada at the time was published in Hamilton: the *Kanadai Magyar Nepszava* [Canadian Hungarian Voice of the People].

These sketches of immigrant communities are supplemented by a series of contemporary personal statements, obtained by the author in the course of his Canadian tour, concerning the first phase of immigrant urbanization in Canada. They consist in the first place of personal interviews with Canadian civil servants and political notables. They illustrate by way of verbatim citations the firm policy of the Canadian government to admit only those immigrants who were willing to accept employment on farms. They also refer to specific statistical and economic data on the substantial numbers of immigrants who were primarily interested in urban-industrial employment. As a result of the large-scale attempts to evade official Canadian immigration policies, Canadian immigration officials tended, understandably, to regard the new, industrially-oriented immigrants with disfavor. The personal statements cited by the Hungarian reporter provide interesting and detailed information on these themes. Another series of personal testimonies provide information of the viewpoints of established Hungarian settlers respecting the new Hungarian immigrants arriving in Canada in the 1920's. Interestingly these statements indicate that the old immigrants regarded the new arrivals in much the same light as did Canadian immigration officials. The newcomers appear in these personal records as more or less troublesome transients, deeply affected by experiences in World War I and the subsequent revolutionary movements, who seemed unwilling to adjust to Canadian society. The author gave the following assessment of the new immigration, based on his extensive discussions with Canadians and Hungarian immigrants:

The majority of the new Hungarians do not come to Canada to settle permanently as the old immigrants; they come here to make money and then to return home. For this reason, they do not settle down, they do not establish new Hungarian colonies. The new Hungarian settlements are at best transit stations. Their only reason for existence is that jobs are more abundant there than elsewhere and therefore it is better to spend the time of employment there.¹⁴

The report of Ödön Paizs provides a glimpse of Hungarian immigrant life at the time of the early formation of immigrant urbanization. For this reason it makes a worthwhile contribution to the history of Canadian immigrant groups as well as to our understanding of Canadian urban history. The two reports of Vay and Hoffmann discussed earlier are concerned with an equally important aspect of Canadian immigrant life, the analysis of immigrant social attitudes at the time of their entry into modern Canadian society. The latter reports contribute therefore to the prehistory of those social and ethnic influences which have played a significant role in the emergence of present day Canadian ethnic societies. In view of their value as

records of immigrant social attitudes, the reports discussed in this paper ought to be considered as informative sources for an understanding of contemporary Canadian social history.

NOTES

1. A. P. Vay, *Amerikai naplókivonatok. Utijegyzetek. Levéltöredékek* [American Diary Excerpts. Travel Notes. Letter Fragments] (Budapest, 1910).
2. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 96.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 101-102.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 141-142.
6. Hoffmann published three articles in Hungarian journals concerning his American and Canadian experiences: "A magyar telepesekről" [Concerning Hungarian settlers], *Magyar Gazdák Szemléje* [Hungarian Smallholders' Review], Vol. XVI (February 1911), pp. 129-133; "Az amerikai kivándorlás újabb iránya" [The new direction of emigration to America], *Pesti Hírlap*, August 20, 1910; and "Tapasztalatok a jelen és jövő kivándorlásának színhelyéről" [Observations concerning the place of present and future emigration], *Pesti Hírlap*, November 20, 1910. Of the three, the first article is the most substantial. Hoffmann's most detailed account of his travels is contained in two reports submitted by him to the Hungarian Ministry of Agriculture. Both are accessible to scholarly research in the Hungarian National Archives. His report on his American tour is dated January 25, 1908 and is located in the following collection: Földművelésügyi Minisztérium, Eln. K-178, 1908-5859, Magyar Országos Levéltár [Hungarian National Archives], Budapest. His report on the Canadian tour is dated July 14, 1910, and is entitled "Dr. Hoffmann Ferencz kassai m. kir. gazdasági akad. s. tanár jelentése kanadai közgazdasági tanulmány utjáról 1909. március - 1910 június-ig," Földművelésügyi Minisztérium, Eln. K-178, 1911-3749, Magyar Országos Levéltár. Hereafter this latter report will be referred to as "Canadian Report, OL."
7. Canadian Report, OL.
8. Hoffmann, "A magyar telepesekről," pp. 129-133.
9. *Ibid.* For a more detailed discussion see the Canadian Report, OL.
10. Hoffmann, "A magyar telepesekről," p. 131.
11. Canadian Report, OL.
12. Hoffmann, "A magyar telepesekről," p. 131.
13. Ödön Paizs, *Magyarok Kanadában* [Hungarians in Canada] (Budapest, 1928).
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 102-103.

Count István Tisza and the Preservation of the Old Order*

Gabor Vermes

The first unsure though exhilarating movements of the national re-awakening in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in Central-Eastern Europe and in the Balkans were very much like the first steps of infants who are painfully aware of their weakness and then compensate for it with cries of self-induced encouragement. In the history of nations, this dichotomy unfolds in the latent or open struggle between national anxiety and national self-exaltation. In Hungary's case, the former was fuelled by the consciousness of being a small nation, surrounded by a "sea" of aliens, Germans, Slavs, and Rumanians, and by Hungary's subordinate status in the Habsburg Empire; while the latter was thriving on the memories of a heroic historical past and on the exaggerated political and literary rhetoric of the present. Coexistence between these two opposites was hardly possible, and the efforts by the best among Hungarian statesmen were spent on finding a way out from this predicament.

Count István Széchenyi hoped to find a solution to this dichotomy in a close relationship with Austria, in tolerance of and understanding with the non-Magyar national minorities, and simultaneously, in the building of an economically and socially progressive Hungary. Such a solution would have quelled any anxiety stemming from the sense of being alone and surrounded, and it also would have satisfied national pride. However, the highly emotional content of Magyar national self-exaltation could hardly be pacified by such a rational approach, nor did a shortsighted Austrian policy make the realization of such a plan possible. The torch thus passed to Lajos Kossuth who harbored the illusion that Hungary could carve out a place for itself in the Danube-basin and could, by its example, attract

* Professors Robert A. Kann, Emil Lengyel, and Wayne S. Vucinich kindly commented on the first draft of this article, and Dr. Richard Allen commented on it when delivered at the annual Duquesne University History Forum at Pittsburgh, on October 31, 1974. I wish gratefully to acknowledge their helpful suggestions and constructive criticism.

all non-Magyar subjects of Hungary to the cause of liberty under Magyar leadership. The waning appeal and increasing hopelessness of the Széchenyi concept had to lead to Kossuth, but Kossuth's plan in turn had to end up in flames, in the total destruction of the short-lived Hungarian independence in 1848-1849.

Nevertheless, the abortive revolution did not happen in vain, because both the Hungarians and the Austrians learned from it. Ferenc Deák revived the Széchenyi plan in essence but combined it with the most significant achievement of 1848: the *de facto* independent Hungary under the protective umbrella of the Habsburg Empire. Emperor Francis Joseph came to accept the Deák concept once the war against Prussia was lost. He then considered it advisable to carry out an act of reconciliation, through a restoration of constitutionalism and a duplication of constitutional authority, with the most powerful non-German people in his Empire, the Magyars. The outcome of such an understanding resulted in the Compromise of 1867, which elevated Hungary to equal partnership with Austria.

Theoretically and ideally, the gap between apprehension and illusion was eliminated. Through its association with Austria, Hungary did become a great power, at least in its own estimation, a fact which should have served as a source for both self-assurance and pride. In reality, genuine self-assurance, through an elimination of fear and anxiety, never did come about. The excruciating awareness of being small in numbers and surrounded remained and so did the real and imaginary slights inflicted by the Austrian partner. Thus, behind a deceptively stable surface, the old dichotomy persisted. At the risk of ignoring crucial social and economic issues in a rapidly changing and industrializing society, the epigons of Széchenyi, Kossuth, and Deák kept spending their energies on either trying to prove that 1867 was the final solution, or challenging this view and working to undermine it.

As a minimum guarantee for Hungary's survival, the partnership with Austria was acknowledged by all. Ironically, even the Party of Independence, the so-called "48-ers," paid only lip-service to the ideas of Kossuth, who in his exile persisted stubbornly in defending not only 1848 but 1849, the dethronement of the Habsburgs and the establishment of a Hungarian republic. Instead of following Kossuth all the way, the 48-ers accepted the security offered by the 1867 Compromise, but tried simultaneously to dissociate Hungary further and further from Austria, thereby undermining the basic assumption of close cooperation upon which the 1867 Compromise was built. The absurdity of their paradoxical attitude came to light during their short reign in Hungary between 1906 and 1910, when they could not but govern in the old ways while pretending to be different, or as one

observer put it, "The whole coalition rule was like a circus performance, where the colored lamps had to be lit and turned in such a way that the audience should cherish the illusion that what was black was really white, and what was 67 was really 48."¹ Neither the 48-ers, nor the defenders of the Compromise, the 67-ers, indicated any serious concern about the nationalities question and the social conditions of the peasantry and the gradually emerging urban proletariat. However, social-political stagnation, as well as growing frustration in the wake of the resurgence of the post-coalition power of the 67-ers in the 1910's, drove at least the Justh-Károlyi faction of the 48-ers towards a genuinely more democratic stand, albeit not without a certain degree of ambivalence, particularly on the question of the non-Magyar national minorities. They hoped that universal suffrage would most likely bring to power a government in Hungary which would increasingly rely on the inner resources of the country along with a gradual and partial secession from Austria.

For the 67-ers, the Liberty or later the Party of National Work, the 1867 Compromise was not an act of convenience liable to change, but rather an article of faith and the sole guarantee for the preservation of Magyar supremacy in Hungary. Count István Tisza represented this view most forcefully in the last two decades of the Monarchy's existence. He repeatedly extolled the virtues of the Hungarian people, yet he never truly had faith in their political maturity; he believed that they could easily fall prey to kossuthist "demagoguery" or even to radical and socialist teachings. He feared, not without reason, that a full and free expression of the popular will might terminate the rule of the gentry and aristocracy and endanger Magyar supremacy. Such an eventuality might also end the close association with Austria which then would reduce Hungary from its assumed great power status to insignificance, gravely exposed to non-Magyar hostility within and outside the country. For Tisza, patriotism did not depend on whether Hungarian soldiers in the Common Army responded to commands in Magyar or in German. Rather, the essence of patriotism to him was maintaining Hungary as a great power, through its partnership with Austria, and through Austria as an ally of Germany.

István Tisza did feel most keenly the Magyar paradox, the gap between the nation's dynamic thrust forward and the fear of losing all the gains. The average 67-er was usually a complacent beneficiary and guardian of the *status quo*, but Tisza could see that, even though the alliance with Austria had to be retained as long as Austria abided by the 1867 Compromise, the growing instability on the Austrian domestic scene made it imperative for Hungary to broaden its base of support in some other direction. For him, democratization was out of

the question, and he repudiated forced magyarization and the dream of a Hungarian Empire of "30 million Magyars," an idea which cut across party lines in the Hungarian political arena. Rather, defying the all-pervasive chauvinistic sentiment, he attempted to pursue a policy of reconciliation and compromise with the largest national minority, the Rumanians of Transylvania. His reasons were manifold, but above all, he was motivated by his concern for Hungary's future. This is clear from the underlying theme of his conciliatory policy which stressed the vital interests of Hungarians and Rumanians in the Danube-basin, their interdependence against the common enemy, Pan-Slavism.² Tisza's negotiations with leaders of the Rumanian national minority did strike some response in individual members of this group, especially the clergy, but, on the whole, they did not produce the desired results.

Simultaneously to these negotiations, Tisza as the Speaker of the Lower House (May, 1912 - June, 1913) suppressed by forceful measures the opposition parties in the Hungarian Parliament in order to enable the passage of laws which assured continuous and growing support for the Austro-Hungarian Army. A progressively deteriorating Austro-Hungarian position in the Balkan Peninsula made such a support imperative, and also provoked the necessity, in addition to other domestic factors, of Tisza's appointment as prime minister of Hungary. He was, after all, acknowledged by the monarch as the only politician who had the will and the authority to push through the unpopular military measures. Tisza, over the violent protest of the opposition, formed his second cabinet on June 10, 1913. During these critical times, he used his powerful influence to counter the warmongering of the Chief of Staff of the Austro-Hungarian Army, Franz Conrad von Hotzendorf, and worked against the growing Russian and Serbian influence on the Balkans by peaceful means, particularly by supporting Bulgaria as the pivot of Austro-Hungarian influence there. Tisza's attitude prior to the outbreak of World War I was proud, assertive, even pugnacious at times. Yet, he was very much aware of the dangers threatening Hungary's assumed great power status, and therefore, he was circumspect, cautious, and calculating as well.

It is well-known that Tisza was the only leading statesman in the Monarchy, who—after the fateful shots in Sarajevo—adamantly opposed the war for nearly two critical weeks, the first half of July, 1914, and he changed his mind only by the middle of the month. His reasons for opposing the war were enumerated in two memoranda, submitted to the Emperor-King on July 1 and July 8 and exposed in the minutes of the Council of Ministers for Joint Affairs on July 7. In sum, Tisza, consistent with his foreign policy of prudence and caution,

asserted that to use the assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand as an excuse for reckoning with Serbia would be a fatal mistake. Lacking sufficient proof of Serbia's complicity, the Monarchy would incur the odium of disturbing the peace and would therefore begin the war under the most unfavorable circumstances. Rumania was virtually lost to the Central Powers and Bulgaria was too exhausted to be relied upon. Also, an attack on Serbia could easily lead to a major war which, in turn, would mean unbearable sacrifices and a heavy burden on the Monarchy's financial and economic resources. In spite of such forceful arguments, Tisza called on the German Ambassador in Vienna, Heinrich von Tschirschky, on July 14, and told him that finally he too had decided to pursue an energetic policy against Serbia in order to prove the vitality of the Monarchy and to put an end to an intolerable situation in the South. While saying farewell to Tschirschky, Tisza clasped his hands warmly and said, "We have to face the future newly united, calm, and firm." Emperor William noted on the margin of his ambassador's telegraphic account, "Finally a Man!"³

Tisza's abrupt change of heart has puzzled historians ever since, especially because Tisza was a man of the highest integrity who would never go against his convictions. The historical background was outlined in detail, because placing Tisza's action within a broader historical context may shed some new light on this puzzle. Tisza's first impulses prompted him to opt for peace, because Hungary could only lose in a war. Victory might bring more Slavs into Austria-Hungary, thereby upsetting the delicate ethnic balance of the Monarchy at the expense of the Magyars; on the other hand, a defeat might lead to the dismemberment of Hungary and to the loss of Transylvania in particular. Tisza knew that the failure of his negotiations with the leaders of the Transylvanian Rumanians left the conflict between them and the Magyar state unresolved and kept Transylvania as a potential trouble spot. It also assured, in defense of the co-nationals, the continual hostility of the nominal ally, Rumania, towards Hungary. In sum, Tisza knew instinctively that Hungary's interest, which in his mind was identical with the interest of the Monarchy, demanded not to go on the offensive but to hold the line for the time being. As a staunch advocate of Dualism, Tisza's fundamental sense of security rested with the great power status of the Monarchy. It was quite clear that by 1914, this assumed great power status depended on German support in any major conflict. Austria-Hungary could carry out a punitive expedition against Serbia on its own but never a major war against Russia. Tisza's time of crisis arrived when the German alliance, this *sine qua non* of his sense of security, was called into question. By the second week of July, 1914, a series of messages,

ambassadorial dispatches, and telegrams emphasized that the German government was considering the situation as a test case of resolve for the Central Powers in general and for Austria-Hungary in particular. Should Austria-Hungary fail to act boldly and assert itself as a great power, it would jeopardize German support in the future. Such a "threat" was not spelled out openly but it was implied, and certainly this was the message which registered with the Austrian and Hungarian leaders. Consequently, Tisza had two alternatives left. One was to persist in his opposition to the war and thereby risk Germany's goodwill and support without which the edifice of Austro-Hungarian power would crumble; the other was to suppress all doubts and hope for the best behind Germany's protective shield. Tisza came to reject the first alternative, because no Hungarian leader would risk leaving his nation in a vulnerable and unprotected position. The only exception, Kossuth's example in 1848-1849, was a frightening memento. Sensing this, the leaders of the opposition, Andrásy and Apponyi jumped on the German bandwagon just as enthusiastically if not more than the 67-ers. Even Count Mihály Károlyi, the leader of the left-wing of the 48-ers, supported the war at the beginning, though admittedly, he did not openly endorse the alliance with Germany.

What made Tisza enter von Tschirschky's office on that fateful July 14, was the same concern for Hungary's survival, which had motivated the thoughts and actions of most Hungarian statesmen, from Széchenyi to Eötvös, Deák, Andrásy Sr., and Kálmán Tisza. One may argue that Hungary's survival was not at stake in July, 1914, but by then, the component of national self-exaltation had reached a point where the existence of the illusion of Hungary as a great power was considered tantamount to the country's survival, and for such a cause no risk seemed to be great enough to take.

An additional question concerns Tisza's frantic emotional involvement in the war, hovering between enthusiasm and despair, even hysteria at times,⁴ in a man who had always been in full control of his emotions. One should, of course, make allowances for the hyperbolic rhetoric of the times and for the high stakes involved in the conflict. After all, a war of cataclysmic dimensions was going on, and the prime minister in charge of his country's war effort was bound to react to the events differently from the imperturbable and all-knowing "coffee-house conrads" around the corner. Yet, there was a certain almost predictably Hungarian quality in his state of excitement. As early as 1889, he had said in the Hungarian Parliament, "We have to prepare for war in peace. If this war comes then we can all agree that it will not be a child's play, neither for the Monarchy nor for the Hungarian nation, rather it may well be a life and death struggle."⁵ Four

years later, he pin-pointed Hungary's place in such a struggle, "We can hardly find an example in world history of such a small nation receiving such a great mission from the Divine Providence. This small nation (Hungary) is placed in perhaps the most exposed spot in Europe, in the crossroads of grave dangers and ambitious plans by powerful nations. This little nation defended civilization and freedom against Islam through centuries and had to defend them now against another danger which threatens European culture in the form of Slav absolutism."⁶ The frustrations of his first cabinet (June 17, 1903 - June 18, 1905) prompted Tisza to modify this exalted view and draw a gloomy picture of his nation, capable of fighting for its existence but unable to cope with problems in peace, "It has been demonstrated again what has been a 1000 years old curse upon the nation that only the grave dangers can bring forth the nation's good qualities, that the Hungarian nation can always suffer, bleed, and fight heroic battles for its liberty, but to live with it usefully in peace, to exploit it for the augmentation of its strength, and to utilize it steadily for patriotic and constructive work; no, the Hungarian nation has never been able to do so."⁷ But then better years were to come, and the disaster of the coalition propelled Tisza back to power, and before the outbreak of the war, he found himself in much firmer control over the political situation in Hungary than 10 years earlier. Shortly after the outbreak of the war, on August 27, 1914, Tisza laid bare his thoughts to his friend, Albert Berzeviczy, as follows: "Through 20 years the thought had tormented me that the Monarchy and within it the Hungarian nation is doomed to extinction, because God wishes to abandon the one whose mind He has taken away. In the past few years the situation began to change for the better, because newer and newer events awakened the hope that world history would not brush us aside. Now in these very critical days the die will be cast, but a nation which behaves in such a way confronting the mounting threats can not be condemned by Providence."⁸ Thus, Hungary's precarious position prompted Tisza to follow caution, but once his concern for Hungary could not be alleviated by the peaceful prolongation of the *status quo*, Hungary was called upon in Tisza's mind to perform its historic role as the defender of Western Civilization in Central Europe, a role, which by the gigantic task it implied, demanded the utmost in heroism, dedication, involvement, and sacrifices. Tisza himself then embraced the battle fully as the supreme test of his nation's prowess and vitality, as a providentially predestined ordeal.

Tisza's deep emotional involvement in the war did not of course dull his sense of caution completely. He remained adamantly opposed to territorial annexations in case of a victory, to the incorporation of Serbia in particular, and he was most unenthusiastic about Germany's

unconditional submarine warfare. His sense of fairness was outraged upon receiving news about atrocities committed by the Austro-Hungarian military and civilian authorities in occupied lands and in territories where national minorities were suspected to collaborate with the enemy. Tisza talked of "character assassination of innocents,"⁹ "wanton pestering," and scandalous arbitrariness,¹⁰ and he angrily reprimanded the Hungarian government commissioner of Transylvania, "The best way to set Transylvania ablaze is if we treat every educated Rumanian as a scoundrel and an enemy."¹¹ Nevertheless, his overpowering ambition during the war was to expand and fortify Magyar influence in the Monarchy and enhance his country's prestige. He could do so because no one in Austria among the politicians matched the single-minded forcefulness of his personality, and because he had a parliamentary majority behind him even after his resignation as prime minister on May 23, 1917, while in Austria the *Reichsrat* was not even called into session until late in the war. Also, Hungary's relative weight, as the granary of the Monarchy under Entente blockade, grew beyond the limits set by any constitutional clause or population census.

The gigantic life-and-death struggle and Tisza's total involvement in it made it imperative for him never to allow any erosion of his justification for the Hungarian war effort. Such a single-minded determination, assisted by Hungary's increasing influence and a concomitant contempt for Austria's weakness, caused him to handle Austria not as a respected equal but rather as a junior partner with a mixture of annoyance, condescension, and mistrust. He wrote to the Minister of Finance in the Council of Ministers for Joint Affairs, Count Istvan Burian, on June 6, 1917, "The traditional Austrian brotherly love embraces everything with a passion which does damage to Hungary."¹² He also spoke of the "slumbering virility of the people of Vienna."¹³ In a January 5, 1915, letter to the Foreign Minister, Count Leopold Berchtold, Tisza wrote, "The efforts of Austria and also the average value of the Austrian troops are way below ours. This is a fact that I am naturally silent about, nevertheless I cannot maintain the opposite."¹⁴ It is an admittedly thin credit to his often mentioned sense of fairness that he still manifested some understanding of Austria's needs as documented by those Austrian leaders who had frequent dealings with him. According to General Landwehr, the head of the Central Food Office in the latter part of the war, "Though he (Tisza) often pursued a policy of Magyar particularism, he still had a general view of things and did not ignore the common interest. When I confronted him with demands to help Austria, he never became impatient, he never promised much, but he kept the promises he made."¹⁵ Tisza's official correctness notwithstanding, the

overall Hungarian attitude towards Austria undoubtedly helped to undermine Dualism during the war. In Tisza's case, his sense or proportion on the parity with Austria faded rapidly beside the elementary force of his love and fear for Hungary.

While it was relatively easy to exert Magyar influence over Austria, to do the same *vis-à-vis* Germany was another matter. Here Hungary was on the defensive, and Tisza's thinking in this connection was expressed in his letter to Berchtold on September 3, 1914, "We cannot appear as the weak and timid protégé in the eyes of Germany."¹⁶ He had to fend off constant German pressure to make concessions to Italy and to the Rumanians in Transylvania. He also fought the German "Mitteleuropa" plan which he characterized as follows in a letter to a journalist friend: "No one appreciates our allies more than I do, but they have the 'good habit' of reaching for the whole arm when one offers them the little finger."¹⁷

Tisza's most perplexing attitude during the war concerned domestic politics. At a time, when most of the warring countries established coalition governments under the banner of the "union sacrée," Tisza refused to swim with the tide and still kept the opposition at arm's length. Also, at a time when mass participation in the war, both on the fronts and in the hinterlands, accelerated the process of democratization everywhere, Tisza stubbornly refused to concede any meaningful extension of the right to vote. Part of the reason for such inflexibility may have been purely personal; after all, he was not a man prone to change and alter his deeply ingrained habits and convictions. Beyond that, however, the high risks involved in the war may have made him less rather than more ready to compromise. In combatting the extension of suffrage, Tisza repeated the old arguments with unusual vehemence, which may indicate that he still believed that radical democratization would lead to national disaster, and if so, then such an attempt was to him even more inappropriate if not outrightly sinful when Hungary's survival was at stake.

In conclusion, Tisza's faith in his nation's ability to measure up to the challenge of a life-and-death struggle was destined either to reward him with at least a temporary victory over fear, anxiety, doubts plaguing the Magyar existence for over a century, or to condemn him to be crushed completely. Unknowingly, Tisza played out the ultimate stage of the battle between national anxiety and national illusion, and it was no wonder that when on October 18, 1918, he let slip the words, "We lost the war" in the Hungarian Parliament, according to an eyewitness, "What he said and what he did after that were the movements of a half-dead sleepwalker."¹⁸ When the Károlyi Revolution broke out on the night of October 30-31, he refused to escape from Budapest as if wishing to stay and die. And truly, the Old Order,

his Hungary lay in shambles. 1918 signalled an irretrievable blow to, if not the end of, the Magyar illusion, the idea of national grandeur. Perhaps it was an act of mercy that Tisza did not survive the passing of Great Hungary. On October 31, 1918, he was assassinated by a group of soldiers who held him responsible for the war. The same unshakable Calvinist faith in God's will which has characterized him throughout his long political career, accompanied him to his last moment; when falling to the floor, mortally wounded, he uttered his last words: "It had to happen this way!"¹⁹

NOTES

1. Lóránt Hegedüs, *Két Andrássy és Két Tisza* [The Two Andrassys and Two Tizas] (Budapest, 1937), p. 283.
2. Gróf István Tisza, *Összes Művei* [Collected Works] (Budapest, 1923), III, 56.
3. Max Montgelas, ed., *Die Deutsche Dokumente zum Kriegeausbruch, 1914* (Berlin, 1927), I, 70.
4. Excerpts from his letter of April 17, 1915, to Burián, "I hope that I shall receive the telegram which reports on Bülow's conversation with Sonnino. Isn't there any news from Bucharest yet? Can not Fasciotti report anything interesting? My dear friend, I am not a nervous man, but I must feel the burden of the moment. Literally, the fate of the Monarchy is at stake, and a delay in decision may provoke a catastrophe which we must avert with exerting ourselves to the utmost . . . we must do more to alleviate the Italians' hostility . . . we must dispel their bad humor which we caused by our dilatory attitude . . . we have no time to lose . . . I write to you in haste with a tormented soul; I do express myself flimsily. The essence of the matter is that time is flying and only days separate us from the moment when inertia or inadequate activity might create an irreparable situation." — Tisza, *op. cit.*, p. 248.
5. Gróf István Tisza, *Képviselőházi Beszédei* [Parliamentary Speeches] (Budapest, 1930), I, 22.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 237.
7. Speech at the "Terézváros" Casino on October 10, 1904, quoted in József Östör, *Tisza István Saját Szavaiban* [István Tisza through his Own Words] (Budapest, 1927), p. 130.
8. Tisza, *Összes Művei*, II, 93.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 169.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 151.
11. *Ibid.*, III, 21.
12. *Ibid.*, VI, 352.
13. *Ibid.*, III, 318.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
15. Ottokar Landwehr, *Hunger* (Wien, 1931), p. 85.
16. Tisza, *op. cit.*, II, 117.
17. *Ibid.*, III, 140.
18. Farkas József, ed., *Mindenki Új Utakra Készül* [Everyone is Preparing for the New] (Budapest, 1962), I, 50.
19. Gusztáv Erényi, *Graf Stefan Tisza* (Wien, 1935), p. 378.

Horthy, Hitler and the Hungary of 1944*

Peter Gosztony

Was the Hungarian Regent deluding himself when on the seven-teenth of March, 1944, on Hitler's invitation, he left Budapest on a special train to meet the *Führer* at Klessheim castle near Salzburg? We know today that in Horthy's own entourage there were a few who had tried to dissuade him from making this journey. But the 76 year old head-of-state was still thinking in terms of the political morality which had prevailed in the days of Emperor-King Francis-Joseph. He had no conception of totalitarian politics, albeit the example of President Hacha (whom Hitler had lured to Berlin in 1939 so that he could bully this sickly man into consenting to a German occupation of rump-Czechoslovakia) should have made him wary of Hitler. But Horthy welcomed the German invitation: he did want to talk to the *Führer* in person, so that he could intervene with him personally and effect the release of the Hungarian divisions still fighting on the Eastern Front. "These divisions must be used to strengthen the Carpathians," was Horthy's excuse: in the spring of 1944 the Red Army was not more than a hundred kilometers from the Hungarian border.¹ In reality, through the return of the troops, Horthy had hoped to effect the defection of Hungary from the Axis in spite of the fact that the plan which he and Premier Miklos Kallay had concocted earlier (calling for Anglo-American paratroopers in the heart of Hungary) had proved unworkable.²

Ever since the spring of 1942, the Regent and the Premier had sought the opportunity and the means of taking Hungary out of the "German war" as smoothly as possible. After the Axis disasters at Stalingrad and Voronezh, they had put out feelers even to Moscow, but the response of the Soviets was negative.³ The discussions with the Anglo-Americans had gotten under way in earnest only after the fall of Mussolini; but plans which might have had concrete results were formulated in theory only, and were executed only on "paper".

* The author would like to express his thanks to Professor N.F. Dreisziger for translating this article from Hungarian into English.

The Kállay government's freedom of action was limited by Hungary's geographic location. Not without good reason did Horthy complain in the summer of 1943 to Colonel Gyula Kádár, the Chief of the Counter Intelligence Division of the General Staff: "Many urge that we should get out of the war, but no one can tell me how. I cannot simply appear on the Royal Palace's balcony and shout: I have defected! In 24 hours the Germans would bring [i.e., install in office] Szálasi . . ."⁴

By this time Horthy had behind him the tense encounter with Hitler of April, 1943 (also in Klessheim). On this occasion the *Führer* had denounced Kállay, accusing him of "treason" and "dealings with the enemy". He had demanded the Premier's removal and urged Horthy to implement "strict controls" over the Jews of Hungary. Ribbentrop, who was also present, abetted Hitler: all Jews were paid agents of the British Secret Service, they must not be allowed to come and go freely. In Hungary, *horribile dictu*, there were Jews sitting even in Parliament! According to the records of the meeting which have survived, Hitler advised Horthy to collect the Jews in concentration camps and put them to work in the mines. Horthy defended Kállay and denied his "English connections." In regard to the Jews, he declared with indignation: "He had done everything against the Jews that can be done with decency. After all, he could not murder them or do away with them in some other way!"⁵

The war years had made relations between Hitler and Horthy tense. In 1936 the Regent, after their first encounter, had talked with admiration of the *Führer*. After the Kiel visit of 1938 (when Hitler had tried to get the Hungarians to join in on an invasion of Czechoslovakia) his enthusiasm diminished.⁶ The conservative Horthy was repelled by the primitiveness of Hitler and his parvenu followers. The Regent's dislike of Hitler was reciprocated by the latter. "Moreover," explained Edmund Veesenmayer to this writer in a letter, "[Horthy] despised [Hitler], believed him to be untruthful and lacking all traces of humanitarian feeling. Horthy was smart enough to respect the enormous power of the German *Reich* and try to use it to his own advantage, but he did not and could not like Hitler even as a politician. Von Papen stood ten times closer to the Regent. After all, Papen was a former diplomat, an ex-officer who had the manners of a landed aristocrat. This was Horthy's world! Hitler represented the exact opposite . . ."

Veesenmayer, German Minister and Plenipotentiary in Hungary during the last year of the war, was familiar with conditions in that country and had kept a close eye on Horthy. In 1943 he had prepared a detailed report on Hungary's internal and external policies and had been one of the originators of the idea of the occupation of Hungary by German troops. He did not have a high opinion of Hungarians as a

nation, albeit in his private conversations he still likes to reminisce about the "beautiful days in Budapest." Veessenmayer arrived in Hungary in Horthy's company on 19 March 1944. What had transpired in Klessheim during the previous 48 hours is quite well known, although no official German record of these discussions has been found to date. The fact that, after Hitler's threats and arguments, Horthy gave his consent to a "peaceful" German occupation of his country, was a recognition of the realities of the situation. The German war-machine had gone into action on the 18th of March, it could not have been called to a halt easily. Moreover, the Hungarian military leaders, who were summoned to a conference with Kállay in the early hours of the 19th, with the exception of General Lajos Veress, voiced the hopelessness of armed resistance. Kállay was not blind and knew what he was saying when he said: "I will not be a part to a comedy! Either the nation resists as a whole, or it does not resist at all!"⁷ Horthy's assurances, sent by telegram from his special train, dashed all thoughts of resisting that had been entertained in government circles.

Why did the Regent consent to the German occupation? Why did he buckle under before Hitler and if he did, why did he not resign and give up his exalted position? Horthy answers these questions honestly and in detail in his memoirs. What he had written is confirmed by the numerous documents that have come to light since. Horthy had agreed to replace Kállay, to appoint a government agreeable to the Germans and to mobilize Hungary for total war in the interest of Nazi Europe. In return, Hitler promised that no Slovak, Croat and especially, Rumanian units would participate in Hungary's occupation and that the German troops would remain for three months only at the most, until the new German Ambassador and Plenipotentiary, "Parteigenosse Veessenmayer" would assure the *Reich's* government that Hungary was fulfilling its obligations toward the Axis. All what Horthy saw in this was that, even though he would have to toe the German line at first, *later* he could use his influence as head-of-state to turn events to his country's advantage. Even communist historians admit the rationale and soundness of this approach.⁸

As Horthy arrived in the Royal Palace of Buda, he was met by German guards. It was only now that it really registered in the old man's mind that Hungary had come under German occupation. Kállay had fled to the Turkish Embassy. Many of his associates had been arrested by the Gestapo, while his friends and acquaintances were hiding in the country. Colonel Kádár describes the spirit of Hungary after March 19th in his unpublished memoirs:

Unfortunately I cannot say that in Budapest there was general bitterness or even indignation. Rather, a kind of submissiveness had taken over the city. The people blamed Kállay who, according to them, had gone too far. If someone's arrest became known, people said there must have been a reason for it. At General Staff Headquarters retired officers sought their reinstatement in active service; others demanded their overdue promotions saying that they had been passed over because of their rightist outlook. The right-radicals were celebrating . . . As far as the general public was concerned, there was no reaction worthy of mention. In the offices and factories the work continued as if nothing had happened . . . Leftist groups went underground.⁹

Kádár (who was arrested several days later by the Gestapo because of his English connections) spent the next couple of days trying to reach Miklós Horthy Jr. (the official leader of the "Bureau of Defection"). On March 22, in the midst of a downpour, he sought admission at the gate of the Royal Palace. "In the courtyard, huddled to the wall, German soldiers stood in raincoats with their sub-machine-guns. All exits were closed. Near the gates guards stood with machine-guns. The young Horthy informed me that his father had been confronted by a German ultimatum. If no government was appointed by 6 p.m., the Germans would take power themselves. And then he said that preparations had been taken for resistance—with a handful of guards? Not one of the units of the Honvéd knew about these preparations . . ."10

That same evening Horthy consented to the appointment of the cabinet of Sztójay.¹¹ Veessenmayer must have been satisfied. At least this is what his telegram to Ribbentrop suggests. Ribbentrop took the message to the *Führer* who was in conference with Marshal Anton-escu. Hitler explained to the Rumanian leader, who must have been elated with joy, that Hungary had lost his trust forever, and that he would tighten the regime of occupation if necessary. As far as Transylvania was concerned, he could say that for him the Vienna Award of 1940 had lost its validity. Through her double dealing, Hungary had lost her right to Northern Transylvania. But the tense political situation in the Danube Valley required that for some time this decision be kept secret. Common interest required that there should not be partizan resistance in Hungary. Every division that can be diverted from Hungary, will strengthen the Eastern Front!¹²

Contrary to the wishes of Regent Horthy, Sztójay's cabinet became a coalition. Veessenmayer had desired it so. Every right-wing group was represented in it except the Arrow Cross Party of which Hitler's plenipotentiary thought very little. And 112 hours after the occupation, Horthy had to agree to a joint Hungarian-German press release, according to which the *Wehrmacht* had entered Hungary as a result of a "mutual agreement."

The following weeks were spent in the country's "total mobiliza-

tion" for war on the German model. The establishment of a full Hungarian army was completed, and it was sent to the front beyond the Carpathians. Rationing of food and consumer goods was introduced and work discipline was tightened especially in munitions factories. Legislation was passed dissolving all leftist and liberal parties and associations. Their press organs and assets were confiscated. The Gestapo, along with the suddenly reorganized Hungarian secret police, began hunting down people whose names appeared on "political black lists." The radical solution of the "Jewish question" became one of the main tasks of the new government. The wearing of the yellow star was enforced, and the collection of Jews in "ghettos" started. Next came the deportation from Hungary of the Jews living outside the capital. From the Royal Palace Horthy viewed these developments with resignation. He felt a prisoner in his own residence. Right before his eyes his country, until then an oasis in wartorn Europe, became a supply base for the *Wehrmacht*. He had been informed of the deportations from several sources. But he, like his immediate associates, were under the illusion that the Jews were being deported "only" to work in Germany where there were great shortages of labour. "We at that time had never heard of the extermination camps: how could we even think that such things existed?"¹³

During mid-May, however, reports concerning the treatment of the Jews by the gendarmerie and their fate in German concentration camps, became more frequent. The Hungarian churches protested. The papal nuncio to Hungary appealed to Horthy in a note. In June the Jewish Council also succeeded in reaching the Regent: through the late István Horthy's widow and through Miklós Horthy Jr. they let Horthy know about the terrible fate that awaited Hungarians of the Jewish faith abroad.¹⁴ Horthy still did not want to believe that a cultured nation like the German could be capable of such barbarities as the senseless slaughter of defenceless persons. But when the so-called "Auswitz record book" reached his hands, Horthy decided to act. In his note of early June to Sztójay, he requested "the curbing of the excesses in the implementation of the measures designed for the solution of the Jewish question" and stated:

I have not had the power to veto any measures which had been taken by the Germans or by the government on German wishes. Although I have never been told of these measures in advance, and have not kept informed on many of them at all, recently it has been brought to my attention that in this regard often more is done here than in Germany, and in such brutal and even inhuman manner that has no parallel in the measures taken by the Germans.¹⁵

Next, Horthy argued for the exemption of certain Jews on grounds of their profession or religious beliefs and demanded that the

During early June, Horthy thought of replacing the Sztójay government with Géza Lakatos and other loyal men through a *coup d'état*. But the General excused himself on various grounds and refused to accept the task assigned to him. This incident should have served as a warning to Horthy that he may not be able to co-operate fully with Lakatos. During the next few weeks Horthy was conspiring to bring home the Hungarian units from the Front. In this matter he again approached Hitler. At the same time he summoned General János Vörös, the Chief-of-Staff, and put the question to him squarely: if Hitler refuses to consent to the withdrawal of the Gestapo and the SS from Hungary, would the Hungarian Army be ready and able to confront the Germans in a military showdown? General Vörös described his answer in his personal diaries:

I reported that our strength was inadequate for an armed confrontation with the Germans. In spite of their many difficulties on the fronts, the Germans still had enough strength, especially heavy armour, to crush any resistance here. In this case the country would look as it did after the Mongol invasion. Such a move would cause the weakening of the Carpathian front and would free the road for a Soviet invasion of the Danube Valley. This would mean our certain destruction. I emphatically asked his Highness not to entertain the idea of such a military solution under the present circumstances . . . ²⁰

On July 17th Horthy received the Minister of Defence, Lajos Csataj and General Vörös. The subject was again the question of military action against the Germans. Vörös once again opposed the idea. "The Eastern Front would collapse, the Soviet troops would pour in, from the south Tito's partizans would come; the whole country would become a battlefield. The best service we can do for the civilized West is to resist the advance of Bolshevism with our blood . . ." ²¹ And when Horthy declared that he would not wait any longer for Hitler's reply and at the end of the month he would appoint a new government without consulting Berlin, Vörös, instead of supporting him, responded negatively. ²² That same day, moreover, the Chief-of-Staff revealed the contents of the interview to his deputy and to Colonel Lajos Nádas, the Chief of Defence Operations, who (as it became known later) was a secret member of the Arrow Cross Party and was Szálasi's adviser on military matters.

On the 22nd of June the Soviet Army launched an attack on a wide front north of the Carpathians. As a result of the Russian's success, the 1st Hungarian Army was split in two. The German commander of the North Ukraine Army Group ordered General Károly Beregfy to hand his command over the Hungarian units north of the Carpathians to the 1st German Panzer Army for the duration of the defence of Lemberg (Lvov). Beregfy delayed with the execution of this order. The Germans took the matter to Horthy. The Regent got

two officials in charge of deportations László Endre and László Baky, be dismissed from the government. By the time these lines had reached Premier Sztójay, the fate of the Hungarian Jewry had been sealed. From a report of Veessenmayer we know that to the end of June, 437, 402 Magyar Jews had been deported from the country.¹⁶

As a result of Horthy's emphatic intervention, the Jews of Budapest, some 200,000 people, were saved from deportation. But Horthy had done even more. When, on July 2nd, on the orders of Baky, 1,500 gendarmes arrived in the capital and some three to four thousand took up positions in its environs in order to start the deportations there, the Regent, acting through the liberal wing of the resistance movement, had some Honvéd units put on alert to forestall the plan.¹⁷ Albeit Horthy was never a friend of the Jews, his anti-semitism stood far removed from that of Hitler. The Regent can be blamed for much, with or without good reason, but he cannot be accused of inhumanity. His stand on the question of the Hungarian Jewry was a belated one, but he stuck to it during the following months and made no concessions. He emphatically rejected all attempts by the Sztójay government aimed at elevating its anti-Jewish measures to laws. This had led to the resignation of Deputy-Premier Jenő Rácz who left office in protest over the Regent's veto. Vessenmayer was forced to report to Berlin at the end of June: "... nothing has happened in connection with the Jewish question. The halt [in deportations] is still in effect on the Regent's orders. He is completely unbending on this issue."¹⁸

In May Horthy had received Szálasi, on the Arrow Cross leader's repeated requests. He never expected much of the man who saluted him with the words "Heil Horthy" [Kitartás Éljen Horthy!], but formed the worst opinion of him after a ninety minute interview. Later, before his confidants, Horthy called Szálasi muddleheaded and a political fanatic. By this time Horthy had begun to formulate a plan for the regaining of control over the direction of the country's affairs. Following the advice of Count István Bethlen, he wished to dismiss the Sztójay government at the first opportunity and replace it with a cabinet of military men. For his next premier, Horthy decided on General Géza Lakatos who had just returned from the Front in possession of a German Iron Cross; as such he was above suspicion in Hitler's eyes. Early in June, before D-day, Horthy wrote a letter to Hitler. He described developments in Hungary and asked for an end to the occupation. In rather frank and undiplomatic language Horthy outlined his country's situation and even complained about the occupation. "In contravention of the orders of their superiors, the Gestapo and the SS treat Hungary as an enemy country. I refrain from detailing what has gone on here and what is still going on..."¹⁹ Horthy's letter remained unanswered.

through to Beregfy on the telephone. "The German Minister had just left my office," he said. "He registered his protest according to which you are not executing the orders of the German command. You know that the units on the front are subordinate to the Germans and their orders have to be carried out. But do you remember the verbal instruction I gave you the last time we took leave of each other? Do you recall what I told you when you took command of the army?" Beregfy replied with a yes. And when the call was ended, the General wiped his perspiring forehead, stared in front of him for a moment and turned to the two other staff officers present in the room:

Although I should not, I must tell you what his Excellency had told me when we last took leave of each other. He had advised me that according to the agreement with the Germans he had no say in the deployment of Hungarian units on the front. But, if the Germans attempt to take away as much as one single division from the Carpathian zone, the agreement becomes void. Hungarian units can be deployed only in the Carpathian sector and can withdraw only in the direction of the country's boundaries!²³

On the 31st of July General Beregfy was replaced. The new commander of the 1st Hungarian army, which by this time was moving towards the Carpathians, became Béla Miklós, the former director of Horthy's Military Bureau. It was at this time that the still existing and, indeed, very active "Bureau of Defection" succeeded in finding someone with contacts in Soviet Russia. He was, by his own confession, a former landowner from Upper Hungary who had fought in the Russian Civil War on the side of the Reds. He claimed to know the Soviet leaders and said that he had been a friend of General Voroshilov.²⁴ In the Royal Palace of Buda there was a sigh of relief: the contact man had been found! The reason for this feeling of satisfaction in Budapest was the fact that the Regent, while making the preparations for the changeover in Hungary, was also anxious to make the necessary foreign policy moves. In Switzerland, György Bakách-Bessenyei (Hungarian Minister in Bern until March 19th 1944) began discussions with Allen Dulles and the British. What he was aiming for was a joint Anglo-American occupation of Hungary. But the Red Army could not be neglected either. Strange as it may seem, however, the Hungarians had no contacts whatever with the Soviets. In the neutral countries, Hungary's representatives had resigned in March to protest the German occupation. They were replaced mostly by pro-German *chargés*. And in Switzerland, where the loyal Bakách-Bessenyei was operating, there were no Soviet diplomats.

Early in September Rosemberg, the "former landowner" and the newly found contact man, was taken by special limousine to Huszt, the headquarters of the 1st Hungarian Army. But there he had a

change of heart. "He brought up all kinds of excuses, including his advanced age, and said that he was afraid to go on the mission" wrote the officer who had accompanied Rosenberg on a subsequent car trip to Budapest.²⁵ Soon thereafter, on the initiative of the Bureau of Defection and a few leaders of the resistance movement, attempts were made to establish contacts with the Soviets. But none of the Hungarian agents had official accreditation, and Moscow did not react to the feelers. In fact, the Soviet leaders took the mission of Baron Ede Aczél almost as an insult: how could Horthy entrust the negotiation of an armistice to an ensign?

The month of August had brought many important, in fact, fateful developments both in the realm of the internal and that of external affairs. Horthy received representatives of the liberal resistance movement who came to him with a completed government list. Either Zoltán Tildy, the leader of the Smallholder Party, or (temporarily) István Bethlen must become the new premier. There must be a coalition government in which all the democratic parties and even the communists had representation. Horthy announced that he had decided to break with the Germans for good. At the first opportunity he would appoint a military caretaker government. This would do what he wanted it to do because he would "retain control over the forces."²⁶

On the 23rd of August King Michael of Rumania had the pro-German government of Antonescu removed. The Marshal himself was arrested in the Royal Palace. The new government, headed by General Sanatescu, appealed for and obtained an immediate armistice with the Allies. Responding to a Royal proclamation, the Rumanian Army opened the front before the Soviets. In his rage, Hitler had Bucharest bombed. What this had achieved was that the Rumanians declared war on their former allies and began hostilities against them. Horthy used these dislocations in the political and military affairs of southeastern Europe to make his move. While assuring Veesenmayer of Hungary's continued loyalty and promising to "send all available units" to the front to compensate for the Rumanian perfidy, Horthy sent for Lakatos and on the 25th forced Sztójay to submit his resignation. Still, the formation of the new government took four days. Veesenmayer refused to agree to the appointment of the Lakatos government unless two reliable pro-Germans (Béla Jurcsek and Lajos Reményi-Schneller) were included in it.

The government of Géza Lakatos was the government of "defection." At least, this was the task assigned to the General by the Regent. Although we have no reason to doubt Lakatos' honesty and his loyalty to the Regent, events proved that the Premier was more of a hindrance than an asset to Horthy's subsequent plans. He could not

understand that the extraordinary times and circumstances had placed special demands on him and his country. He wanted to discharge the responsibilities of his high office in strict observance of constitutional formulas as if it had been peace time. One must agree with Lieutenant-General Béla Aggteleky, presently of the city of Genf, who, after many years of research, has come to the conclusion that the appointment of Lakatos as Premier was a grave mistake which predetermined the outcome of the events of October 15th.

Immediately following his appointment, Lakatos was confronted by several important decisions. As a result of Rumania's defection, the Transylvanian question again became the central issue of Hungarian politics. Extreme nationalists and even some high-ranking officers were calling for the invasion of southern Transylvania: here was the opportunity to regain the rest of Transylvania from the "perfidious Rumanians." The strategic situation also demanded that Hungarian or German forces occupy the passes of south and eastern Transylvania and thereby prevent the Red Army from crossing the Carpathians. But neither Hungarian nor German troops could be spared for this purpose. And Hitler was still hoping to establish a Rumanian "counter-government" with whose aid he could dislodge the "king and his clique" in Bucharest. If he consented to a Hungarian occupation of southern Transylvania, however, no Rumanian politician would co-operate with him. In Budapest, the Council of State also dealt with the question of southern Transylvania. By that time Horthy had in his hand a telegram from Bakách-Bessenyei warning against any anti-Rumanian moves: after all, Rumania had joined the Allies and it would be a grave mistake to get involved in a war with the Sanatescu government.²⁷ The question of the uprising in Slovakia was also discussed. This anti-Nazi rising had broken out on the 29th of August. The Germans had asked for Hungarian troops to help to quell it, but the Lakatos government refused the request on various grounds.²⁸ By doing so it made a significant contribution to the initial success of the uprising.

On the 31st of August the new Rumanian government officially requested Budapest to evacuate Northern Transylvania which had been awarded to Hungary "illegally through the Diktat of Vienna."²⁹ Hungary was given 48 hours to accept the ultimatum. Even before this time was up, military operations were started by Rumania. In response to this an attack was launched by the Honvéd in the Kolozsvár-Torda sector.³⁰ After some successes the Hungarian offensive was halted; moreover, the Rumanians soon mounted a counter-offensive with the aid of Soviet units which in the meantime had crossed the Carpathians. Within two weeks the Soviet-Rumanian forces reached and in some places even crossed the pre-1940 border of Hungary.

The whole month of September was spent in frantic discussions. Horthy wanted to return to the basic foreign policy line of the Kállay government and call for an English-American occupation of Hungary—even if only with a token force of one or two divisions of paratroopers. He sent General Náday to Allied headquarters in Caserta, Italy, for negotiations. Through Colonel-General Gustáv Henyey, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, he tried to attain his aim in the secret discussions with Allied representatives in Bern. All this was done in spite of the fact that Bakách-Bessenyei had warned in a telegram already at the end of August: “. . . in order to avoid any misunderstanding, it must be made clear that discussions cannot be limited to the English and the Americans; every attempt at the exclusion of the Russians from them could lead to disaster.”³¹ And when Horthy continued to adhere to the idea of an “Anglo-American” solution, the message arrived from Bern on the 21st of September. “Nothing,” began the telegram in a plain and clear language, “but an unconditional surrender can be entertained. It is hopeless to imagine that the English and the Americans will sacrifice their own troops so as to save us who have persevered against them to the very end, from the Russians and the other, smaller allied powers. The only course of action left to us is to offer an unconditional armistice and thereby prevent the further waste of Hungarian blood!”³²

Among Horthy's advisers perhaps the only realistic statesman was Count Bethlen.³³ He had realized early in September that for an armistice Hungary had to turn to the Russians and could not turn to anyone else. Bethlen had reached this conclusion in spite of the fact that the wildest rumours were reaching the Palace in these days. “Well-informed members of the resistance movement” on the fifth of September claimed to have learned from the Swedish Embassy that an Anglo-American force was to appear on the Drava River within five days. Indeed, in mid-September some English units landed on the islands of the Dalmatian coast. In the Royal Palace in Budapest this was taken as the beginning of the long awaited invasion of the Balkans by the Western Powers.

In the meantime there were talks and more talks. Horthy received General Guderian and, on several occasions, Ambassador Veesenmayer. He held discussions with the more prominent figures of the resistance movement and, on the 14th, even Samu Stern, the President of the Jewish Council, paid a visit to the Palace. From the beginning of the month, Horthy was stressing the need for a break with the Germans and the ending of Hungary's involvement in the war at “any price.” On the 7th there was a meeting of the Council of State presided over by Horthy himself. The whole cabinet was there as well as the Chief-of-Staff and the heads of the Regent's Military Bureau and

Bureau of State. At this meeting Horthy "officially" announced his plan. Lakatos immediately asked to speak and declared that without the consent of Parliament he, as Premier, would not undertake the task. The Regent replied that "Parliament no longer reflected the will of the nation because many members were under arrest, others were hiding and the rest were intimidated. He did not agree with the Premier's views. He concluded the debate by the sentence: I stand accountable before the nation and history!"³⁴

In his recollections, written on 28 October 1944 in Tihany, Lakatos described the Regent's plans in the following way:

The difference of opinion between His Excellency the Regent and the union government had become manifest already during the first weeks . . . He was guided by the highest of ideals when he repeatedly voiced the view that a way had to be found to approach the Allies lest the end of the war would find us on the side of vanquished Germany. This was in essence his basic aim. It must be added that through this policy he wanted to prevent useless loss of blood and the slaughter of Hungarian youths. He was confident that if the Russians flooded the country not as conquerors but as a force occupying a country which had concluded an armistice, the extermination of the educated, the mass deportations and material destruction would take place on a reduced scale . . .³⁵

On the 11th of September, at a meeting of Horthy's "secret advisers" the decision was reached: Hungary had to turn to the Soviet Union for an armistice. Gradually Horthy realized that in this manner he could not count on the support of the Lakatos government. But that government could not be replaced. "[Horthy] was determined to carry out his plan . . ." wrote Lieutenant-General Antal Vattay, the Regent's aide-de-camp, in his unpublished memoirs, "even though he was left to himself; there was no other solution for him: he had to leave the government out and act alone!" Vattay remarks that "At the time the Regent was 77 years old but despite this he undertook the difficult step, against his government's wishes. Everyone in close contact with him could notice that the years and the many family tragedies did not pass him by without leaving their marks. His will and vitality was not the same any more, the signs of advanced age were showing, but in spite of his many years he persevered in his decision even though his spirit had been strongly shaken by the behaviour of his government."³⁶

During the next few weeks the delegation which was to be sent to the Soviet government was selected, while the tireless Lieutenant-General Bakay reinforced the security forces of Budapest and began preparations for the expected developments. Through General Újszászy, and with the aid of Imre Kovács, contact was made with the leaders of the illegal Communist Party, László Rajk who promised to arm the workers of Budapest if the party could get weapons from the

army.³⁷ (Rajk was under false illusions: his party had a "membership" of 80 to 100 men. The workers followed either Szálasi or Demény and Weissshaus, the leaders of the Communist Party's trotskyist faction.) Strangely enough, the Regent trusted Chief-of-Staff Vörös and even on the 15th of October, he was convinced that his orders would be obeyed by the Honvéd down to the last man. Only Colonel-General József Heszlényi, the pro-Nazi commander of the 3rd Army, was slated for dismissal. General Ferenc Farkas, the commander of the Fourth Army Corps, was to take over the 3rd Army. The Commanders of the other two armies, Béla Miklós and Lajos Veress, were dedicated followers of the Regent. When they advised Horthy to issue the armistice proclamation from the headquarters of the 1st Army in the Carpathians, the old gentleman indignantly rejected the suggestion: in these stormy days how could he leave the ship's bridge that the Palace represented?

The well-known events of the 15th of October quickly foiled the plan which had taken Horthy many months to prepare. The reason for this is easy to establish from the distance of three decades: the pro-Nazi elements within the government and the high command were informed about every move made by the Regent. They alerted the Germans who, with Veessenmayer at the helm, could take immediate counter-measures. In fact, the Germans even had an advantage: they had plenty of time to prepare Szálasi's *coup d'état*. In the critical hour Horthy found himself alone. The Germans had made sure that his most loyal followers: Generals Szilárd Bakay, Kálmán Hárdy, Lajos Veress and Béla Aggteleky, were not at their assigned posts. Moreover, by kidnapping Miklos Horthy Jr., the Germans assumed the initiative. The population of the capital and the country watched the unfolding of events in the Royal Palace with apathy, as if their fate was not affected by the struggle. The members of the resistance movement, liberals or communists, did not stir. Only in three places in Budapest was there armed resistance against the Germans and their Arrow Cross allies: in the Royal Palace, where General Lázár and the palace guards fought a besieging force under SS-Colonel Skorzenyi, on Népszínház Street where Jewish conscript workers fired on a column of Arrow Cross men, and in the Andrásy Armories where officers with Arrow Cross sympathies shot Colonel István Latorczay as he tried to rally the soldiers to the defence of the Palace. On the front, the units were silent. János Vörös went into hiding so that while matters were being decided he did not have to give orders. Local commands seeking directives were instructed by Colonel Lajos Nádas in accordance with Szálasi's wishes.

The last act of the tragedy that had taken place in the Palace, started on the 16th. From Lakatos down almost to the last man, all

urged Horthy to reach a compromise with the Germans: to withdraw his proclamation of the previous day and resign. The tension of the past 24 hours had broken Horthy. In return for the life of his one remaining son (whose safety Veessenmayer swore to guarantee) the Regent signed the papers placed before him including the appointment of Szálasi as Premier.

No, Horthy did not become a General Moscardo as the Palace of Buda did not become the Alkasar of Toledo. To his credit, Horthy in the last hour had tried to save his country from destruction by the German and Russian armies. In the interest of his nation he was willing even to come to terms with the Soviets, although (as Imre Kovács puts it in one of his studies) "what communism represented and practiced went against his upbringing, heritage, ideals and entire past . . ." In connection with the "defection," Horthy himself had committed blunders: he made a poor choice of associates, trusted blindly in the loyalty of the army and refused to attack his former ally, the *Wehrmacht*, in the back. Furthermore, to the very end he honoured the promise he had given to Hitler that if Hungary ended the war against the Allies, he would inform Berlin in advance.

In the evening of the 16th, the Germans took ex-Regent Horthy and his family to Kelenföld station where a train was waiting for them. On Hitler's orders, they were to be taken for detention to Hirschberg near Weilheim in Barvaria. Almost twenty-five years earlier Horthy had arrived at Kelenföld station to start his march into the "evil city" to restore order. The era associated with his name was born then in blood and disgrace. Now, in 1944, that era expired in blood and disgrace despite Horthy's best intentions.

NOTES

1. Miklós Horthy's letter to Adolf Hitler in the matter of the withdrawal of the Hungarian divisions on the front to the Carpathian line of defence. Miklós Szinai and László Szücs (eds.), *Horthy Miklós titkos iratai* [The confidential papers of Miklós Horthy] (Budapest: Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1962), p. 409.
2. For details see: Nicholas Kállay, *Hungarian Premier: A Personal Account of a Nation's Struggle in the Second World War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954).
3. Sándor Radó, *Dóra Jelenti* [Dóra reports] (Budapest: Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1971), p. 269. Radó, a colonel in the Red Army, was the chief of Soviet intelligence operations in Switzerland during World War II. At the end of February, 1943 the Hungarian Ministry of External Affairs contacted Radó in Bern, requesting that he mediate between the Soviet Union and Hungary concerning a peace-pact. In March of 1943 Radó got a negative answer from Moscow. In his recollections he writes: "This move had no chance of ascertaining the attitude of the Soviet Union toward a compromise peace!"
4. Gyula Kádár, "Emlékezés az ország német megszállására: 1944 március 19" [Memories of the country's occupation: 19 March 1944] *Hadtörténelmi*

- Közlemények [Military History Communications] 1974 no. 1, p. 78.
5. Andreas Hillgruber (ed.), *Staatsmänner und Diplomaten bei Hitler. Vertrauliche Aufzeichnungen über Unterredungen mit Vertretern des Auslandes, Zweiter Teil: 1942-1944* (Frankfurt am Mai: Verlag Bernard & Graefe, 1970) p. 245.
 6. For details see: Pál Pritz, "A kieli találkozó" [The Kiel meeting], *Századok* [Centuries] 1974 no. 3, pp. 646-679.
 7. *A tízhónapos tragédia. 1944 március 19 - 1945 január 20* [The ten-month-long tragedy: 19 March 1944 to 20 January 1945] First and second part. (Budapest, 1945), p. 47.
 8. György Ránki, *1944 március 19* [19 March 1944] (Budapest: Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1968).
 9. Kádár, *op. cit.*, p. 90.
 10. *Ibid.*
 11. Döme Sztójay, Hungarian Minister to Berlin, 1936-44; Hungary's Premier from March to August of 1944.
 12. Hillgruber, *op. cit.*, p. 392.
 13. Information from a source very close to the Horthy family.
 14. For further details see: Ernő Mucsi, *Hogyan történt? Adatok és okmányok a magyar zsidóság tragédiájához* [How did it happen? Facts and documents on the tragedy of the Hungarian Jewry] (Budapest: Renaissance Kiadás, 1947), especially chapters 5 and 6.
 15. Miklós Horthy's memorandum to Döme Sztójay in the matter of the moderation of the excesses of the government measures taken for the "solution" of the Jewish question, also in the matter of the dismissal of László Baký and László Endre. Szinai and Szűcs, *op. cit.*, pp. 450-53.
 16. Veesenmayer's telegram to the German Foreign Office, 11 July 1944, in György Ránki et al. (eds.) *A Wilhelmstrasse és Magyarország. Német diplomáciai iratok Magyarországról 1933-1944* [The Wilhelmstrasse and Hungary. German diplomatic documents on Hungary, 1933-1944] (Budapest: Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1968), p. 881.
 17. See the manuscript of Ferenc Koszorus, "Az első erőszakos náci hatalom átvételi kísérlet megghiusítása Budapesten 1944 júliusában" [The defeat of the first Nazi attempt to take power in Budapest, July, 1944], in the author's possession. Colonel Koszorus was the commander of the armored division which, on Horthy's order, was dispatched in the direction of Budapest in order to prevent by force a possible coup by the gendarmerie.
 18. Veesenmayer's telegram to Ribbentrop, 21 July 1944, in Ránki, et al., *op. cit.*, p. 455.
 20. Peter Gosztony (editor and translator), "Das private Kriegstagebuch des Chefs des ungarischen Generalstabes vom Jahre 1944," *Wehrwissenschaftliche Rundschau* 1970 No. 12, p. 706.
 21. *Ibid.*, p. 708.
 22. *Ibid.*
 23. Béla Király to Peter Gosztony. In 1944 Király served with the Fourth Hungarian Army Corps as a captain of the General Staff. He had been present during Beregfy's telephone conversation.
 24. The letter of Lieutenant-Colonel Lajos Csukássy-Gartner to the author, 25 February 1969. Csukássy-Gartner was Béla Miklós' personal aide in 1944. According to other sources, Rosenberg claimed to have made the acquaintance of Voroshilov in the 1930's when he had sold horses to the Soviets.
 25. The letter of Csukássy-Gartner, *cit.*
 26. For details see István Pintér, *Magyar antifaszizmus és ellenállás* [Hungarian anti-fascism and resistance] (Budapest: Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1975) pp. 346ff. See also the unpublished recollections of Dr. Pál Jaczkó dealing with the liberal resistance movement of 1944 (MS in the author's possession).
 27. János Csima (ed.), "A horthista diplomácia előzetes fegyverszüneti tárgyalásai Bernben 1944 augusztusának végén és szeptember havában. Táviratok."

- [The preliminary armistice negotiations of horthyite diplomacy in Bern at the end of August and in September of 1944. Telegrams], *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* [Military History Communications] 1965 No. 4, p. 732.
28. The manuscript of István Bárczy de Bárcziháza on the 1941-44 period, p. 97. Copy in the author's possession. (From 1928 to 1944 Barczy was the *chef de protocole* of the Premier's office as well as the keeper of the minutes of the Ministerial Council.)
 29. V. Anescu *et al.* (eds.), *Rumania in razboiul antihitlerist 23 august 1944 - 9 mai 1945* [Rumania in the war against Hitler 23 August 1944 to 9 May 1945] (Bucharest: Editura Militara, 1966) Also: Daniel Csatári, *Forgószélben. A magyar-román viszony, 1940-1945* [In the whirlwind: Hungarian-Rumanian relations, 1940-1945] (Budapest: Akadémiai Könyvkiadó, 1968).
 30. For details see Lajos Veress, *Magyarország honvédelme a II. világháború előtt és alatt, 1920-1945* [Hungary's defence before and during World War II, 1920-1945] (Munich: Nemzetőr, 1973), Vol. III. pp. 9-68. During the autumn of 1944, General Veress was the commander of the Transylvanian (Second) Hungarian Army.
 31. Csima, *op. cit.*, p. 732.
 32. *Ibid.*, p. 734.
 33. Count István Bethlen, from 1921 to 1931 Hungary's Premier during the Second World War one of Horthy's pro-English advisers.
 34. Bárczy, *op. cit.*, p. 118.
 35. Peter Gosztony (ed.), "Lakatos Géza beszámolója a miniszterelnöki tevékenységéről" [Géza Lakatos' account of his activities as Premier] *Új Látóhatár* [New Horizon], 1970, No. 5. p. 444.
 36. The recollections of Lieutenant-General Antal Vattay; a manuscript written in 1965. Copy in the possession of the author.
 37. For details see Imre Kovács, *In Schatten der Sowjets* (Zürich: Thomas Verlag, 1948), pp. 50-54.
 38. János Kádár, "A Kommunisták Magyarországi Pártja felosztása körülményeinek és a Békepárt munkájának néhány kérdéséről, 1943 június - 1944 szeptember" [Concerning the circumstances of the dissolution of the Hungarian Communist Party and the work of the Peace Party, June 1943 to September 1944] *Párttörténelmi Közlemények* [Party History Communications] 1956, No. 3, p. 20.
 39. Imre Kovács, "Kiugrási kísérletek a második világháborúban" [Attempts at separate peace during the Second World War] *Új Látóhatár*, 1963, No. 3, p. 266.

Book Reviews

Das Völkerwanderungszeitliche Graberfeld von Környe. By Ágnes Salamon and István Erdélyi. (Studia Archaeologica, V.) Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1971. 184 pp., 31 fig. 14 plates, \$16.00.

This book, which was extremely well received by Eastern and Western European scholars, has to my knowledge not yet been reviewed in an American periodical. Among Eastern European scholars, Russians, Czechs, Rumanians, and Hungarians wrote extremely favorable critiques. In the West, German, Swiss, and Austrian experts have also found the work to be trailblazing, opening up a new direction in the research on the Great Migration period after the collapse of the Western Roman Empire. The book presents documentation which will require a revision of the currently accepted chronology of the appearance of the early Avars in the Carpathian Basin.

The material treated came from 152 graves near the town of Környe. It is worthy of note that about 50% of the bone material discovered was suitable for anthropological examination. The biochemical examination of the skeleton findings was made by I. Lengyel; the morphological and general anthropological analysis, by T. Toth. The book is written in German with the exception of the analysis by Toth, which appears in English.

Toth's anthropological analysis also suggests a possible need for correcting the chronology of the appearance of the Avars in the Danubian area. Toth believes that the predominance of the Proto-Europoid and Mediterranean characteristics of the Avars is possibly connected with an autochthonous group of the Roman period both in the Central Danubian Basin and in the Transdanubian area. All the foregoing shows strong analogies to the early Avaric period. It is noticeable that many horse burials were discovered at Környe. The orientations of certain group graves indicate a possible family burial system. In addition to the assembled wooden coffins, many coffins were carved out of tree trunks.

In the third part of the book the authors describe all their findings in great detail. The presentation of the findings was made by the Computer Code System which Salamon established for Avaric remains and published in 1966.

The scientific treatment of the findings is extremely effective. Well-designed diagrams give quick views for the reader of the results of analyses performed. In the sociological analysis the authors group together the graves as those of the rich, average and poor, which gives a new aspect to their analysis. On another chart, the yields are also grouped together for historical and sociological analysis according to their utility and not to sex of the skeleton. (Female, male, child.) However, a general short tabulation of sexes in relation to the findings is also included.

Since the anthropological report concluded that the autochthonous and the German migrant groups could easily have composed the early Avar epoch in Környe, I would welcome another tabulation to show statistically the stylistic origin (Byzantine, Roman, German, Avaric and other barbaric) of the findings in relation to the position and the network of the graves and to the anthropologically established racial distribution.

On the basis of the classification in six groups and the analysis of all grave articles, the authors conclude that the stylistically heterogeneous origins of the findings are represented in most of the graves. This fact suggests quite a cosmopolitan though homogeneous society of the early Avars, who maintained and mixed Western, Byzantine, and inner Asiatic artistic and utilitarian traditions.

The assumption of the heterogeneous nature of the Avars has long preoccupied scholars as a highly hypothetical and controversial issue. The excavation in Környe is indeed a great step forward toward the acceptance of this highly disputed thesis. Perhaps this is the reason why both Eastern and Western scholars were so eager to review and evaluate this book so positively.

By suggesting the heterogeneous nature of the Avars the authors are opening the door to further hypotheses which will stimulate scholars to further scientific disputes. It is stated as a possibility that the cemetery of Környe holds the remains of the settlement of mercenary groups from Byzantium. This settlement also contained racially heterogeneous elements.

Since the publication of the book, the result of research on the weapons found at the excavation in Környe has been published. The scholarly world now is awaiting the publication of the physico-chemical examination of the ceramics and the serological date of the bones. Such additional information will complete the evaluation of the finding of the Avaric cemetery in Környe, for which the book of Salamon and Erdélyi is essential.

Sándor Petőfi; His Entire Poetic Works. A translation by Frank Szomy. 2nd ed. (Boca Raton, Fla., Published by the Author, 1972. Illus. Pp. 773).

Frank Szomy's intention, to make available an English translation of the poetic works of Sandor Petofi is a laudable one. Unfortunately, neither his command of the nuances of Hungarian nor his talent for English versification is equal to the task. In all fairness it should be noted that Mr. Szomy assumes no false airs and acknowledges in the "Foreword" that "the effort has been devoted to giving an accurate version of the thoughts and ideas of the poet." This much is generally accomplished, even when some of the thoughts suffer so much in the translation that their freshness and vitality disappear.

In general, poems that are chiefly narrative or descriptive are more successfully translated than those lyrics in which both the imagery and the music of the lines are essential to the total meaning. So a poem like *The Apostle* communicates the meaning of Petofi's original. However, since the excellent verse translation of Victor Clement has been in print for more than ten years, Mr. Szomy would have been well advised to give merely a brief prose summary and direct the reader to that work. It is this lack of awareness of the scholarly work in progress, this isolation from current scholarship in Hungarian literature that is one of the major drawbacks of the work. It is certainly at the root of most of the errors found in the volume.

The two other long narrative poems, *The Village Hammer* and *John the Hero* have not yet appeared in a better English version, so Szomy's rendering of the story is adequate. Unfortunately, Petofi's playful and ironic style does not come across in the translation of the former, and the mock heroic tone is lost. A study of the techniques of Pope's *Rape of the Lock* or Byron's *Don Juan* would profit any translator of the satiric Petofi. The second epic is an even more difficult poem to translate. Petofi uses a genre and a vocabulary that is not familiar to the Western reader. The imaginative world of the poem is closed to the translator, as it had been to John Bowring and William Loew, though Szomy at least gives an accurate version. Still, some disturbing elements remain: "Kanaan" of Canto XI is translated as "Caen," and in Canto XIII the imagery is transformed into pedestrian verbosity:

Johnnie Corn and the princess
Reached the battlefield at sunset.
The setting sun's last rays
Looked with reddened eyes at the terrible scene.

Even the name, "Johnnie Corn"—a literal translation—comes across in English quite differently from the melodic and romantic "Kukoricza Jancsi."

In most of the poems the failure to render the connotation of the words prevents the translator from capturing the tone of the poem even when the "dictionary" equivalent is accurate. The real meaning is lost when "Asszonyom" in "Maria Szechy" appears as "My woman; the literal translation of "kikeltik" by "hatch out" in "I Hear the Sound of the Lark Again" brings in connotations that are inappropriate to the poem. The list can go on, and regrettably these are not always merely errors in tone but also in sense: "könynyü termetedet" translated by "your light nature" is inaccurate as well as destructive to the mood of the poem; "a varmegye embere" is not "the men from Var County," nor is "lovagkor" the same as "days of horses." Finally, the poem on his parents' death speaks of a reunion (vizsontlatas; , not a farewell. Other times the translation is disturbing even when not quite so far from the mark: "saloon" is not the equivalent of "kocsma" and there is no such word as "saloon-keepstress."

This would be nitpicking, were it not that such errors detract from the meaning and effect of the poem. If the purpose of translation is to make an author's work known beyond his country, and Mr. Szomy avows this is his intention, these errors are real problems. The poet's passionate appeal against German tyranny is lost in "Governor Bank" as the first stanza degenerates into meaningless phrases:

That second Endre . . .
Labored, under a slipper, to breath;
His wife held the reins
Of the country,
And the wagon did sway because of this,
First this way and then that way.

The English idiom of "henpecked" and the original of "from one side to the other" would render the sense much better. The use of slang ("own bunch," "gotten lost") and grammatical errors of case and tense further dilute the effect of the original. "Okatootaia" (shortened for some reason to Ikatoota), a satire on Hungarian backwardness and an attack on Austria, loses its point when the parentheses in "Austr(al)ia" are eliminated.

In the foreword, the translator disclaims any effort at a poetic translation, yet some poetic effects can not be ignored. One expects an accurate reproduction of the sense of the poem, and often this means a duplication of tone and mood as well as words. "From Afar" loses its meaning when the limpid iambics disappear in halting prose arranged in short lines; "At the End of September" likewise fails. Marital poems such as "I Dream of Bloody Days" and "National Song" or a marching

song like "Rise to the Holy War!" are not the same when the beat is lost.

As mentioned earlier, many poems in the book give an accurate idea of Petöfi's thoughts. Thus "Patriotic Song," one of the early poems, captures both the meaning and the spirit of the original, as does "Finally I Can Have Julia" and the poem "To Laci Arany." Others could be added to the list, but there is no point in such a catalogue. The reader should consult the work and, keeping in mind the shortcomings, use the literal translations as a guide. Unfortunately, it can not be used to savor the poetry of Petöfi.

Many problems could have been solved if Mr. Szomy had had an editor, or at least had consulted with someone who was acquainted with Hungarian literature and the rules of formal English. Such glaring errors as the translation of "Vörösmartyhoz" as "To Marti Voros" or Ottokar as "Otto Karol" would have been avoided. Similarly, the use of capitals for common nouns (Komondorok, Kikiris), possessives for plurals (Szekely's), and the nominative case where the accusative is required for the indicative mood where the subjunctive is needed would have been corrected. Typographical errors (a execrated; *slim* for *slime*; Visakna), though relatively few, are nevertheless disturbing, especially since one is never certain that these were not intentionally written so. Finally, an editor would have caught the problem of using only one source: "Egri hangok" is translated as "The Bells of Eger" since the text used by Mr. Szomy has this error; to anyone who is acquainted with Petöfi's poetry the mistake is obvious, though even without this prescience, the title has no relevance to the poem.

The final problem is Mr. Szomy's desire to give an "Americanized" version. To attain this this, he takes liberties with idiom and names. The latter is extremely disturbing when historical or literary figures are re-named, when proper names appear without accents (Gomor; Kecskemet; Alföld; Honderu; Matyas) or when a needless reversal of order results in the poem "To Miss B.O."

The book, published by the author, is handsomely bound and the pen and ink drawings that illustrate it further enhance its appearance. The typed manuscript, photographically reproduced, is neat and very readable, though a drawback of this method of printing is that the book is too bulky. The arrangement of the poems follows the chronological one generally used in editions of Petöfi's complete poems. The table of contents helpfully gives the Hungarian as well as the English titles, though the lack of an alphabetical index is regrettable.

The magnitude of the undertaking, and the evidence of dedicated work, deserve praise. Furthermore, as a working tool for other trans-

lators—in the nature of an interlinear version—this volume can be of service. It is the only *complete* translation of *all* of Petofi's poems into English, and it certainly surpasses the recent issue of some rudimentary notes by Anton Nyerges (*Petofi*. Ed. by Joseph Ertavy-Barath. Buffalo, Hungarian Cultural Foundation, 1973) precisely in this. Later translators can certainly be indebted to Frank Szomy and his family for this systematic work.

The American University

Eniko Molnar Basa

NEWS ITEM

The Immigration History Research Center will again offer grants-in-aid and research assistantships during 1976-77.

Grants-in-aid up to \$3,000 for travel and living expenses are available to doctoral candidates, recent Ph.D's and established scholars. Deadline for 1976 applications is November 15, 1975.

Research assistantships for graduate students enrolled at the University of Minnesota and engaged in studies relating to American immigration and ethnic history are available for the academic year 1976-1977. Candidates should be proficient in one or more languages of Eastern, Central or Southern Europe, or the Middle East. Deadline for 1976-1977 applications is February 15, 1976.

For more information, please contact the

Immigration History Research Center
826 Berry Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55114

Review of Reviews*

Hungary. By Paul Ignotus. Nations of the Modern World. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972, Pp. 333.

The very first impression is disconcerting. Here is another brief history to be added to the dozen other brief histories headed by C.A. Macartney's *Hungary: A Short History* (Edinburgh University Press, 1962) when what we need is a long history of Hungary in English . . . The first chapter seems to confirm the disillusionment: history until the end of the eighteenth century is dismissed in forty-odd pages not free of clichés and factual mistakes . . . But then, Mr. Ignotus, a well-known and talented writer but not a professional historian, himself protests his bias in the introduction as to what he finds interesting in Hungarian history and what he doesn't. He comes into his own with the description of the first Reform Generation of intellectuals in Hungary, and his writings thereafter becomes breathtakingly interesting. Foreign policy remains neglected to the end, but domestic affairs are treated judiciously and in great detail, and we learn more and more of the role intellectuals, especially writers and poets, played in politics. The approach is urban and liberal, which causes some peasant politicians and populist writers to come out badly: a judgement which I cannot but agree with. There are beautiful passages on Hungarian society, the explosive role of the Jews, the accomplishments of the second Reform Generation of intellectuals in the early twentieth century, the troubles of the interwar period—that Ignotus knows personally—and the triumphs and disasters of the post-1945 era in which the author played a distinguished role, except when he languished in prison as a victim of Mátyás Rákosi. The concluding description of Hungary today is scholarly and fascinating; the style is always elegant and witty, but factual errors continue almost to the end . . . This is a travelogue that takes the reader through history and through the lives of Hungary's political and cultural leaders: the guide

* The inclusion of a book in this section does not preclude a review of it in the Book Review section of a future issue of *CARHS*.

shows only what he wishes to show, but his explanations are almost always excellent. There are good pictures and a fine appendix on Hungarian language and poetry.

Istvan Deak (Columbia University), *Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 45, No. 1 (March 1973).

Stephen Széchenyi and the Awakening of Hungarian Nationalism, 1791-1841. By George Barany. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1968. Pp. 487.

Unlike some studies of the past dealing with Hungarian history Professor Barany's work relies on a formidable array of primary material. He also utilizes documents previously unknown to Széchenyi scholars. This ambitious study sets out, according to the title, to deal with the life story of Count Stephen Széchenyi and his impact on the emergence of Hungarian nationalism. Actually, it covers only the first fifty years of his life. Yet the scope is much broader than suggested by the title: it also encompasses numerous related aspects and details of the Hungarian, the Austrian imperial, and European backgrounds . . .

The name of Stephen Széchenyi (1791-1860) pertains to the same historical context as that of Louis Kossuth. While in the 1840's the image of the latter was gradually growing into an epitome of freedom and national reform, it was the former who could not avoid regarding it as his misfortune to have enabled Kossuth to become the spokesman for the nation. It was Széchenyi whose mind proved most susceptible to the new ideas of Europe of the time. Thus he adopted sufficient liberalism to initiate and stand up for social, political, and economic changes on a large scale . . . He became enough of a nationalist to feel emotionally involved in the promotion of what he considered Magyar national interests. But he showed himself circumspect in discerning danger in the introduction of sweeping changes. He was sufficiently cosmopolitan and courageous to insist on the according of fair and just treatment to all the nationalities of Hungary. His attempt, however, to unmask Kossuth as a reckless agitator and a firebrand, only facilitated "the rise of a new star [Kossuth] over the horizon." Széchenyi himself suffered an agonizing blow in both losing popularity with the liberal opposition and failing to gain moral and political support from Metternich . . .

Széchenyi kept diaries regularly—an almost unique occurrence among Hungarian politicians—from the age of twenty-three through

all his adult life. The author interprets them "as analogous to subconscious material elicited by psychiatrists during the process of free association." This assumption enables him to argue on the basis of psychoanalytical considerations that some of the motives for Széchenyi's reforming zeal and many of his public activities derived in a large degree from highly subjective motives . . .

The author does refer to Széchenyi's "system" of thought, but is content at this stage to present the related material grouped as it occurs in Széchenyi's successive writings. However, even such terse references to it as "idealistic," "romantic" and that it is "rested on the immovable values of supreme justice and the rewarding inner calm of one's conscience" tend to stress the true dimensions of the mental conflicts analyzed in the book. Not enough prominence is accorded to the salient role that philosophy, ancient and modern, as well as religion played in the cultural climate of Széchenyi's era. Indeed, he was a true son of his age in this respect and consistently adhered to principles adopted in his youth . . .

The proper evaluation of influences leading to Széchenyi's mental collapse and eventual suicide remains to be presented in the continuation of the present volume, alongside the integration into a final summation of many penetrating, but somewhat isolated observations, often the results of brilliant analysis.

Factual errors apart . . . this is an exhaustively researched book, written in a crisp, very readable style. It will be an indispensable tool for Széchenyi historians and students of the history of nineteenth-century East-Central Europe.

Martin L. Kovacs (University of Regina), *Canadian Journal of History*, Vol. VII, No. 1 (April 1972).

Joseph Eötvös and the Modernization of Hungary, 1840-1870. A Study of Ideas of Individuality and Social Pluralism in Modern Politics. By Paul Bódy. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series, Volume 62, Part 2, Philadelphia, 1972. Pp. 134.

One of the major assumptions of the study posits that it was the ideas and ideals embraced by Joseph Eötvös (1813-1871) in his formative years that were, often against the pressure of public opinion or prevailing political trends, the decisive factor in the formulation of his political recommendations, as writer, creative politician, and Minister of Public Instruction in 1848 and 1867-71, towards the resolution of the long-festered problems of his country.

The early influences most active in the formation of young Eötvös's thought are traced in the study very appropriately through the guidance of his cultured German mother to the classical humanism of Goethe's and Herder's Weimar, and to patriotism and reforming liberalism through the mediation of his private tutor of Jacobin leanings. During his university studies he became more involved in the Hungarian past and its unique and original bearer and custodian, the Magyar peasant. The readings of Victor Hugo, Sismondi, Tocqueville and Guizot tended to sharpen his existing views and to deepen his understanding of the working of society . . . Eötvös, a true son of his intellectual forebears, was also fascinated by the harmonious coherence of things and by their underlying unity and wholeness. But to him, the most important of all unities was *man* who, as a free agent, ought to possess dignity and freedom in its political, social, economic and cultural aspects. Man's separation from his dignity and freedom, his alienation from *wholeness*, from belongingness to human community, owing to such accidents as sociocultural differences, was regarded by Eötvös as the most serious ailment, the root of all other evils. Thus Hungary's manifold problems in his time tended for the statesman to come to a head in three major issues: the abolition of noble privileges or, conversely, the emancipation of the peasants; a clear and acceptable definition of the relationship between Hungary and the empire; and the question of the national minorities. The remedy for such types of alienation Eötvös hoped to find in the judicious extension of political rights, autonomy both at the private and at the institutional-group levels yet within the same *existing* political structure. However, as Eötvös had the occasion to argue against Széchenyi, the necessary condition for the proper exercise of civil rights, which in turn forms the prerequisite of all peaceful reforms, is constituted by education. For it is cultural progress and the resultant deeper insight that enhance respect for the rights of others and human dignity . . .

Dr. Bódy finds that the continuity between Eötvös's youthful thought as expressed most systematically in his novel *The Carthusian* and his greatest political feat, the Elementary Education Act, 1868, is very tangible indeed. This fact and the modernity of the intentions of the Act emerge strikingly from the author's terse summary describing this law as "the attempt to protect the variety and freedom of education in the broadest sense by acknowledging the right of each individual, township, association, nationality and church to sponsor and exercise control over schools."

Evidently, his educational proposals, incorporating recommendations on secondary and higher education as well which, however, never became laws, were meant by Eötvös to complement his Nation-

ality Bill of 1867. This much-debated proposal recommended the use in public official communication by each citizen, township, church and county of his or its native or official language, but with the strict observation of the related rights of the central Hungarian government, and of individuals or groups constituting minorities within minorities. The resultant *Nationality Act*, 1868, was passed only with major amendments . . . The reluctance with which Eötvös's two Acts were passed by the legislature and the lack of appreciation on the part of most minority leaders indicated absence of sufficient public support for the measures. These attitudes and the gradual whittling away by successive Hungarian ministries of some of the guarantees provided in the two Acts do not appear quite unexpected, we may add, in the atmosphere of post-1850 Europe of *Realpolitik*, linguistic nationalism, and social Darwinism . . .

One major strength of Dr. Bódy's study lies in his fine, penetrating and sustained analysis of Eötvös's thought and its interaction with the harsh reality of his contemporaries' political opinions and ambitions. He skillfully portrays Eötvös's growing private frustrations over the failure, with a few exceptions, of politicians both of the governing Magyar nation and of the national minorities to rise above the fragmented state of ethnocentric interests and to create a truly pluralistic multi-national state as earnestly requested by the statesman, and simultaneously suggests the same failure as one of the main reasons for the ultimate collapse of the Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy. Further, this volume constitutes, in English, the first and only comprehensive treatment of Eötvös as thinker and politician, and is written in a lucid and very readable style . . .

Martin L. Kovacs (University of Regina), *Canadian Journal of History*, Vol. VII, No. 3 (December 1972).

Nationalism in Eastern Europe. By Peter F. Sugar and Ivo J. Lederer, eds. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1969. Pp. 465.

This collective volume, which intends to explore the pattern of Eastern European nationalism from the eighteenth century to the present, is introduced by Professor Sugar's comprehensive and highly perceptive essay "External and Domestic Roots of Eastern European Nationalism." . . .

Historical literature in English is deficient in works on Albanian and Bulgarian history and in particular on nationalism in these countries. Unfortunately, the reader who looks with keen interest to

Mr. Zavalani's essay on Albanian nationalism and to Professor Pundeff's on Bulgarian, will be disappointed. These are nothing but brief political surveys and as such quite useful . . . Professor Zacek's brief contribution in character, yet unlike the previously noted two essays his is concerned with the history of political nationalism and not just with political history. His survey is certainly rich in factual information. Professor Zydis' longer chapter on Greek nationalism is more strongly steeped in intellectual history and offers much valuable information to the Western reader. Professor Fischer-Galati attempts in a brief essay on "Romanian Nationalism" to do equal justice to political, economic, and cultural factors. His task is complicated by the fact that he has to deal with his problem in the frame of different political units. The same is true for Professor Lederer's "Nationalism and the Yugoslavs." . . .

Unquestionably, the four essays by Zacek, Zydis, Fischer-Galati, and Lederer, each in its own way, make a contribution to their subject; but the two best studies are the ones by Professor Barany, "Hungary: from Aristocratic to Proletarian Nationalism" and Peter Brock, "Polish Nationalism." What distinguishes these two essays is that they put chief emphasis where it belongs, namely on the evolution of ideologies in a broad social frame. They do so, each in a different way, in a comparative, critical manner . . .

All things considered, the reader of the eight essays will have great difficulty in finding even a loose common pattern of nationalism in Eastern Europe which Professor Sugar's challenging introduction invites the authors to pursue further. Yet, he will get much information and some stimulating suggestions as well, altogether not a bad bargain.

Robert A. Kann (Rutgers University) *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*, Vol. I. No. 1 (Fall 1973).

Ausztria és a Magyarországi Tanácsköztársaság, [Austria and the Hungarian Republic of Councils]. By Sándorné Gábor, [Mrs. Sándor Gábor] Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1969. Pp. 301.

Hungary's 400-year association with Austria provoked continual dissension between the two peoples. At the end of the Great War, when the two countries finally emerged as sovereign powers, the old antagonisms continued unabated. The newly proclaimed Socialist sister republics paid only grudging lip service to Socialist unity and solidarity. Far from supporting one another, the two Social Democra-

tic regimes became immediately embroiled in a bitter struggle for the possession of West Hungary (Burgenland), a predominantly German speaking region belonging to Hungary. The controversy intensified when in March 1919, Hungary's Social Democratic and Communist Parties merged, and thus strengthened Bela Kun's Marxist regime rode to power in Hungary. While professing friendship for Hungary's working classes, Austria's Socialists colluded with the Entente to appropriate West Hungary. Not to be outdone, the Hungarian Marxists retaliated by plotting to overthrow Austrian Social Democracy and impose a Marxist regime on their troublesome neighbour. Gabor's work is devoted to the explication of these complex events . . .

The problems with Gabor's work—and unfortunately several serious flaws do exist—lie elsewhere. The work is thorough and exhaustive to a fault; so much so in fact that the themes frequently disappear in a welter of detail and marginalia . . . The author has also tended to make sweeping generalizations without the benefit of evidence . . .

Gabor's topic is important, her research fairly thorough, her presentation unfortunately chaotic and out of focus. The author ought to approach the text with red pencil and scissors in hand, and attempt to rectify the serious organizational and interpretive flaws of what could otherwise have been a valuable monograph.

Thomas Spira (University of Prince Edward Island), *East European Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, No. 2 (summer 1974).

Revolution in Perspective Essays on the Hungarian Soviet Republic. Edited by Andrew C. Janos and William B. Slottman. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California, 1971. Pp. 181.

Revolution in Perspective is the edited work that grew out of a conference held in March, 1969 at the University of California at Berkeley commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. Its editors are both professors at Berkeley and the slick publication of the University of California press provides an excellent little volume for readers interested in the Hungarian communist movement in particular and in Hungarian history in general.

The content of the volume is highly uneven and deals with issues which are extremely varied. By far the best two essays are written by Professor Janos, the first dealing with the decline of oligarchy from the Compromise of 1867 to the end of World War 1, and the second dealing with the agrarian opposition present at the National Congress

of Soviets during the 133 day existence of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. The first article deserves special mention . . . Professor Janos' analysis of the change that takes place in the pattern of the ruling classes is perhaps the best documented study of the social change in Hungary during the fifty years of the Dual Monarchy. His conclusion, that it was the "breakdown of communication that allowed the ascendance of new elites who were neither more humane, nor more democratic than the gentry, but were more skillful in manipulating the symbols of modern politics," (p. 60) sums up the essay as the best single study of those fifty years.

Peter Kenez's article on "Coalition Politics in the Hungarian Soviet Republic" challenges the notion that the Hungarian Soviet Republic was solely a Communist organized and led affair. He also takes issue with the view that Communists bear the whole responsibility for the failures of that era. Although this contention is debated by many historians, it seems to this reviewer that Kenez's viewpoint is the only interpretation uncolored by historical bias. In March, 1919 the ideological distinctions between Hungarian Communists and Socialists were less exaggerated than they are today . . .

Keith Hitchens' article on the Rumanian Socialists and their contact with the Hungarian Soviet Republic as well as the influence of the Kun regime on Rumanian socialism also as a solid piece of historical research. His article points out the split in the Rumanian socialist movement, torn between their nationalistic attachment to Rumania and their Communist attachment to Moscow. Given the historical circumstances and the "strong national feeling and belief that socialism could develop most effectively within the framework of the national state," (p. 144) there was really nothing that the Hungarian Communists could do to create closer contact with Rumanians in general and Rumanian Communists in particular . . .

Professor Slottman's article dealing with the attitude of some Viennese intellectuals (the *Geistesaristokraten*) toward Hungary and—peripherally—toward the Hungarian Soviet Republic is an entertaining essay . . .

The final brief statement by Richard Lowenthal on the Hungarian Soviet Republic and international communism is a melange of personal analysis interspersed with ideas already exploited elsewhere . . .

Ivan Volgyes (University of Nebraska), *East European Quarterly*, Vol. VII, No. 3 (Fall 1973).

Hungary in Revolution, 1918-19; nine essays. Edited by Ivan Volgyes. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971. Pp. X, 219.

Perhaps because of the delays our university presses are subject to, *Hungary in Revolution* missed out on the fiftieth anniversary of the "Kun regime" by about two years. No matter, for . . . the volume remains a distinguished scholarly contribution, whether timely or not. The nine authors who have contributed an essay each to the work are already known in the field of recent Hungarian or recent Central European history, and this volume can only enhance their reputation.

Most of the essays are based on documents and many provide an unusual, if not altogether unique, interpretation of these. We learn from the essay by Eva Balogh that the Hungarian leaders were not eager to help establish an independent Slovak Soviet Republic, and that there was confusion in Slovakia as well as in Hungary regarding the nature of the relationship between those two "Soviet" regimes. Balogh's assertion finds indirect confirmation in Rudolph Tokes' brief biography of Bela Kun (the last essay) in which he notes that, in his youth at least, the Transylvanian Kun was something of a Hungarian cultural chauvinist. According to Alfred D. Low, the Great Powers, although more than a bit shaken by the events in Hungary, demonstrated a great deal of weakness (France included), if not outright moderation, in handling the Hungarian situation—a point of view not generally shared by either Hungarian nationalist or Hungarian Marxist historians . . .

What remains unexplained is why the work has taken the form of a cooperative venture, especially since the essays amount to a more or less complete and chronologically ordered account of the "Kun regime" and the Karolyi regime preceding it. Without meaning to deprecate some original and distinguished contributions, I am convinced that Ivan Volgyes . . . could have written the work by himself; in fact, he probably should have, if only to avoid repetitions and provide a more continuous narrative.

But the overall note of my evaluation is that the work is a worthwhile contribution . . .

Mario Fenyo (Universidad Catolica de Puerto Rico), *East European Quarterly*, Vol. VII, No. 1 (Spring 1973).

Magyarország külpolitikája 1919-1945 [Hungary's Foreign Policy, 1919-1945]. By Gyula Juhász. Budapest: Kossuth Könyvkiado, 1969, Pp. 374.

One of the main tasks Hungarian Marxist historians have set for themselves has been a thorough investigation of Hungarian foreign relations during the interwar period. Though an initial motivation may have been the desire to discredit the "Horthy regime," the result has been the appearance since the early 1960's of a noteworthy series of scholarly monographs covering many important topics from the peace settlement to the German occupation . . . This preliminary work has been done, the opportunity was present for the writing of a scholarly survey of Hungarian diplomacy in this period. Gyula Juhász has undertaken this assignment, and this resulting volume, the only one of its kind in any language, is a admirable and valuable contribution to the study of recent Hungarian history.

Juhász, the author of a previous study dealing with Hungarian foreign policy under Pál Teleki, has blended secondary and archival material to present a skillfully balanced account of the intricacies of Hungary's interwar diplomatic history. His thesis is that Hungary was thrust into the ultimately disastrous cooperation with Hitler's Germany by two factors: the unceasing quest for integral revision of the Treaty of Trianon and the need for the counterrevolutionary government to seek ideologically compatible allies. The only diplomatic constellation which would serve these purposes, as Hungarian leaders from Bethlen to Teleki came to discover, was one in which Hungary maintained firm ties with Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany. These latter two states, like Hungary, were intent on disrupting the peace settlement, and were far more likely than the Western Powers to sanction territorial revision for Hungary . . .

Juhász is at his best in describing the tangled negotiations for a separate peace in 1943 and 1944, the frustrations of the Teleki period, and the attitude of the Great Powers during the peace settlement after World War 1 . . . Somewhat weaker is the author's treatment of the crisis years of the 1930s. The subtle and complex policy of Kálmán Kánya, Foreign Minister from 1933 to 1938, is not properly examined, and the critical role of the Hungarian military in the formulation of foreign policy is not mentioned . . .

These minor criticisms notwithstanding, Professor Juhász is to be congratulated for his mastering of the relevant primary and secondary materials in at least five languages and his skillful weaving of this material into a balanced and readable narrative. The work is an important contribution to modern East European history and deserves to rank high on the list of books awaiting translation into a Western language.

Thomas L. Sakmyster (University of Cincinnati), *East European Quarterly*, Vol. VI, No. 3 (September 1972).

Hitler, Horthy, and Hungary: German-Hungarian Relations, 1941-44. By Mario D. Fenyo. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1972. Pp. xii + 279.

Felicitous language, clarity of style, and lucid logic make this a delight to read. The author has amassed and digested into a well-organized study all the available material. With admirable thoroughness he has checked and rechecked his data in all that has recently been published and in the archives of Hungary and abroad, and he has worked them into a fluent and coherent entity.

His extensive dependence on secondary sources currently in print in Hungary, however, poses a serious and important question. How far should such an approach be taken? It must be acknowledged that historical works produced in Hungary are generally scholarly, rich in variety, and remarkably objective. The more distant the subject is in time, the more evident these qualities are, but the Marxist-Leninist line makes it inevitable that these characteristics become weaker the nearer the subject is to the present time. Treating the Horthy regime academically is simply not tolerated; it has to be viewed mostly from an ideological standpoint. Hungarian works on it have to be used with great caution. Yet Fenyo writes that according to a "Hungarian legal publication," the Hungarian state was "monarchical and Fascist" (p. 9). On this and other occasions the author fails to alert the reader to the partisan nature of such value judgments. He himself terms the Horthy regime "semi-feudal" or "outright feudal" (p. 113). But such a statement surely fails as academic synthesis . . .

Bela K. Kiraly (Brooklyn College and Columbia University), *Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 45, No. 4 (December 1973).

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Yves de Daruvar. *The Tragic Fate of Hungary*. Munich: Nemzetor, 1974.
- Veronika Gervers-Molnar. *The Hungarian Szür: An Archaic Mantle of Eurasian Origin*. ROM History, Technology and Art Monography No. 1. Toronto, Ontario: Royal Ontario Museum, 1973.
- Maria Horvath (compiler). *A Doukhobor Bibliography*. University of British Columbia Library References Publication No. 38. Vancouver, B.C.: University of British Columbia, 1972 (enlarged and revised edition.)
- Martin Louis Kovacs. *Esterhazy and Early Hungarian Immigration to Canada: A Study Based Upon the Esterhazy Immigration Pamphlet*. Regina, Saskatchewan: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1974.
- W. Kirstjanson, et.al. (eds.) *The Multilingual Press in Manitoba*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Canadian Press Club, 1974.
- Alfred D. Low. *The Anschluss Movement, 1918-1919, and the Paris Peace Conference*. Philadelphia, Pa: The American Philosophical Society, 1974.
- Lester A. Rice. *Hungarian Morphological Irregularities*. Cambridge, Mass: Slavica Publishers, Inc., 1970.
- United States, Library of Congress. *Hungarians in Rumania and Transylvania: A Bibliographical List of Publications . . .* (Compiled by) Elemer Bako and William Solyom-Fekete. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.
- Agnes Huszar Vardy. *A Study in Austrian Romanticism: Hungarian Influences in Lenau's Poetry*. Buffalo, New York: Hungarian Cultural Foundation, 1974.
- Steven Bela Vardy. *Hungarian Historiography and the Geistesgeschichte School*. Cleveland, Ohio, Arpad Academy, 1974.
- For a list of further books, mainly verse, prose and fiction, please contact the editor.

The Canadian-American

REVIEW

of Hungarian Studies

Polanyi and the Treason of the Intellectuals LEE CONGDON

Hungarian Studies at American and Canadian Universities
STEVEN BELA VARDY

Origins of Romanesque Rotundas in East-Central Europe
VERONIKA GERVERS-MOLNAR

Lewis A. Fisher and Philip E. Uren. *The New Hungarian
Agriculture* THOMAS A. VANKAI

Agnes Huszar Vardy. *A Study in Austrian Romanticism:
Hungarian Influences in Lenau's Poetry* ENIKŐ MOLNÁR BASA

HONORARY EDITOR

Professor Watson Kirkconnell

EDITOR

Professor Nandor Dreisziger
Royal Military College of Canada

CORRESPONDING EDITORS

Professor Eva S. Balogh
Yale University

Professor Louis A. Fischer
McGill University

Dr. Veronika Gervers-Molnar
Royal Ontario Museum

Professor Geza Kuun
University of New Brunswick

Professor Alfonz Lengyel
Northern Kentucky State College

Professor Paul Pilisi
Université du Québec

Professor Geza de Rohan
University of Western Ontario

Professor Thomas Spira
University of Prince Edward Island

Professor Philip E. Uren
Carleton University

Professor Charles Wojatsek
Bishop's University

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Dr. Enikő Molnár Basa

Dr. Paul Bódy

Professor Kalman Bogнар

Professor L.S. Domonkos

Professor J. J. Csonka

Dr. Peter Gosztony

Rev. Charles H. Henkey, Ph.D.

Rev. Aladar Komjathy, Ph.D.

Dr. Zoltan Mate

Professor Peter Pastor

Dr. Sandor Szilassy

Professor Bela Vardy

Professor Gabor Vermes

Dr. Paul E. Vesenyi

Dr. Ferenc Wagner

EXECUTIVE MANAGER

Dr. Ferenc Harcsar
President, HRS Inc.

Copyright © 1975 by the
Hungarian Readers' Service Inc.
All rights reserved.

ISSN 0317-204X

The *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies* is a semi-annual journal devoted to the publication of scholarly articles and reviews in all fields of Hungarian studies. Subscriptions are \$12.00 for one year and \$20.00 for two years. University students and teachers may obtain personal subscriptions for \$8.00 per annum. Correspondence regarding subscriptions should be addressed to Dr. Ferenc Harcsar, 908-1356 Meadowlands Drive East, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K2E 6K6.

The *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies* is published by the Hungarian Readers Service Inc. from membership fees and donations. Sustaining memberships in the HRS are a minimum of \$100.00 for organizations and a minimum of \$50.00 for individuals; supporting memberships are a minimum of \$50.00 for organizations and \$12.00 for individuals. Correspondence regarding membership should be addressed to Dr. Harcsar.

Statements or opinions published in the *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies* do not necessarily reflect the views of either the Hungarian Readers' Service or of the Journal's editors.

The editors of the *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies* invite the submission of articles and book reviews dealing with Hungarian studies. Manuscripts should be clearly typed on one side of 8½ x 11 inch paper, double spaced, with ample margins. Footnotes and bibliographies should follow the text on separate pages and should be double spaced. The articles should be original and should be offered exclusively to the *Review*. On style, authors should follow previous issues of the *Review* or consult the editor: Dr. N. Dreisziger, Department of History, Royal Military College of Canada, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, K7L 2W3.

The printing of this issue of the *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies* has been made possible through the generous financial support of the following organizations:

In Canada

the Hungarian Canadian Federation
the Hungarian World Federation of Veterans
the Széchenyi Society Inc.
the Calvin Hungarian Presbyterian Church of Ottawa
the Hungarian Canadian Engineers' Association
the Hungarian Helicon Society
the United Hungarian Fund

In the United States

the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America
the World Federation of Hungarian Veterans' Association
the Hungarian Association
the Hungarian Association of International Affairs
the Hungarian School Care Club
the Hungarian United Fund (Detroit Care Club)
the United Hungarian Fund, USA
the United Hungarian Fund (San Diego Care Club)
the American Transylvanian Federation

Printed by Brown & Martin Ltd.
Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

The Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies

Honorary Editor
Watson Kirkconnell

Editor
Nandor Dreisziger

Executive Manager
Ferenc Harcsar

Corresponding Editors

Eva S. Balogh
Yale University

Paul Pilisi
Université du Québec

Louis A. Fischer
McGill University

Geza de Rohan
University of Western Ontario

Veronika Gervers-Molnar
Royal Ontario Museum

Thomas Spira
University of Prince Edward Island

Geza Kuun
University of New Brunswick

Philip E. Uren
Carleton University

Alfonz Lengyel
Northern Kentucky State College

Charles Wojatsek
Bishop's University

CONTENTS

Articles:

Polanyi and the Treason of the Intellectuals 79
LEE CONGDON

Hungarian Studies at American and Canadian Universities 91
STEVEN BELA VARDY

Review Article:

Origins of Romanesque Rotundas in East Central Europe 123
VERONIKA GERVERS-MOLNAR

Book Reviews:

Lewis A. Fischer and Philip E. Uren. *The New Hungarian Agriculture* 131
THOMAS A. VANKAI

Agnes Huszar Vardy. *A Study in Austrian Romanticism: Hungarian Influences in Lenau's Poetry* 133
ENIKŐ MOLNÁR BASA

Review of Reviews 137

Books Received 144

OUR CONTRIBUTORS:

LEE CONGDON is Assistant Professor of History at Madison College. His articles on Hungarian intellectuals have appeared in learned journals on both sides of the Atlantic.

A member of Duquesne University's Department of History, STEVEN BELA VARDY has published widely on Hungarian history and related subjects. His most recent book, *Modern Hungarian Historiography*, is to appear soon in the East European Monograph series. Presently he is continuing his research on this topic in Hungary with the aid of a grant from the International Research and Exchanges Board.

VERONIKA GERVERS-MOLNAR is Associate Curator in the Textile Department of the Royal Ontario Museum and is cross-appointed as Associate Professor in the Department of Fine Arts at the University of Toronto. Her publications include a monograph on Hungarian Romanesque round churches *A középkori Magyarország rotundái* (Budapest, 1972), *The Hungarian Szűr: An archaic mantle of Eurasian origin* (Toronto, 1973) and over twenty articles on diverse East European and West Asian topics in American, Canadian, French, Hungarian and Polish journals.

Polanyi and the Treason of the Intellectuals*

Lee Congdon

In the years since the Second World War, Michael Polanyi has emerged as a philosopher of the first rank. His major work, *Personal Knowledge* (1958), is a brilliant tour de force that manages to steer a course between the Scylla of a critical philosophy that insists upon completely objective epistemological criteria and the Charybdis of a subjectivism that denies the possibility of surmounting caprice. By demonstrating the viability of a personal knowledge that is neither wholly objective nor arbitrary, Polanyi has helped to open paths of thought and existence previously obstructed.¹ Although this philosophic achievement still awaits comprehensive examination, my present intention is more modest; I should like to call attention to Polanyi's lifelong concern with the question of moral and intellectual responsibility and to his thoughtful and devastating indictment of the treason of the intellectuals.

Unlike Julien Benda, whose *La Trahison des clercs* (1927) is generally regarded as the classic statement on the subject, Polanyi recognizes that by far the greatest number of traitorous intellectuals have abandoned the independent search for truth in order to further the revolutionary goals of Marxism. They have offered not only their intellectual freedom but also their moral principles as ransom for a world made perfect; paradoxically, they have sacrificed morality for moral reasons.

Although Polanyi has dated the beginning of his attempts to expose the treason of the intellectuals to the 1930's,² he had, in fact, become initially concerned with the question before 1920 in his native Hungary. Indeed, as his friend and fellow countryman Paul Ignatus has written, "the intellectual environment of his youth has profoundly influenced his development."³ Before turning to his mature critique of Marxism, therefore, it would be well to consider his years in Hungary.

*I am indebted to the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX) for the generous grant that made possible the research for this paper.

Polanyi was born in 1891 in Budapest, the scion of an extraordinary Hungarian-Jewish family.⁴ His father Mihály Pollacsek, a building contractor for Budapest's suburban railways, watched his fortunes soar in the last years of the nineteenth century only to plummet to the earth in the early years of the twentieth.⁵ More important, however, Pollacsek was a man of exemplary character whose life bore eloquent witness to his commitment to the highest moral standards. When, for example, a business venture of his failed, he insisted that every share-holder be paid to the last penny, even though to do so spelled his own financial ruin.⁶ For Michael Polanyi, as well as for his brothers and sisters, the example of Pollacsek's life provided the moral ballast necessary for navigating the stormy seas of twentieth-century existence.⁷

Polanyi's Russian mother, Cecile Wohl, was a high-spirited, energetic woman with a great interest in Hungary's intellectual life. In the years preceding the outbreak of the First World War, her salon attracted men and women, old and young, who were anxious to discuss new ideas from Western Europe. "Mama Cecile," as she was called, reveled in the intellectually-charged atmosphere of fin de siècle Budapest, where, as one contemporary observer put it: "Everyone is talking about Marx or Herbert Spencer; the class struggle, historical materialism, evolution, the organic and inorganic view of the world are on everyone's lips."⁸

This intellectual ferment was generated by the members of Hungary's emerging "counter-culture," a heterogeneous and uncoordinated movement that sought to reawaken the country from the cultural slumber that had begun about the time of the *Ausgleich* or Compromise of 1867. With a few notable exceptions,⁹ late nineteenth-century Hungarian cultural leaders were less concerned with creativity and profundity than with giving expression to an increasingly rigid official ideology that was a blend of clericalism and Hungarian nationalism.¹⁰

The counter-culture centered around two forums: *Huszadik Század* ("Twentieth Century"), a sociological journal edited by Oszkár Jászi, and *Nyugat* ("West"), a literary journal edited by Ignotus.¹¹ These journals accepted contributions from young writers and scholars intoxicated with Western ideas and Western creative experiments and eager to break loose from the fetters that bound Hungarian cultural life. The young writers' confidence was all the greater because of the existence of parallel rebellions in other cultural fields. Two young composers, Béla Bartók and Zoltán Kodály, had begun the work that would soon bring them world renown; groups such as the "Circle of Hungarian Impressionists and Naturalists" and

"The Eight" provided new opportunities for Hungarian artists and suggested new artistic possibilities to the educated public.¹² And Sándor Ferenczi, one of Freud's closest associates, defended brilliantly the epoch-making claims of psychoanalysis.

The gathering counter-cultural forces became self-conscious when, in 1906, Endre Ady published his *New Verses*, a book that boldly challenged the official ideology and spoke in a powerful Magyar idiom of a new Hungary. Not only did Ady place himself at the head of the counter-cultural movement, he also summoned his countrymen to national regeneration, by which he meant the creation of a society governed by moral principles rather than by class privilege. Himself a member of the gentry (though, the impoverished gentry), Ady, like István Széchenyi in the nineteenth century, believed that the Magyar ruling classes, the magnates and the gentry, had become morally derelict and had therefore forfeited their right to speak for Hungary.¹³ Proclaiming himself to be the embodiment of his country's most noble traditions, the proud poet declared that he, not they, possessed the right to command Hungarians and in the exercise of that right, he would recall them to their authentic selves.¹⁴

It was in this turbulent, stimulating atmosphere that Polanyi came of age. From the first, his sympathies lay with the counter-culture and the more encompassing movement for national regeneration.¹⁵ Yet, unlike his elder brother Karl and many of his friends, he was never attracted to radical politics. "His reputation," according to Paul Ignotus, "was that of the man who had the courage to dissent from the dissenters; in a flock of black sheep he shocked many by seeming almost white."¹⁶

As a medical student at the University of Budapest in 1908, Polanyi joined the newly-founded Galileo Circle, a counter-cultural organization of students interested in the sciences—natural and social. Under the leadership of its first president, Karl Polanyi, the Circle announced that its aim was the "defense and propagation of unprejudiced science. Teaching and studying are the means employed in the struggle against religious, racial, and class prejudices."¹⁷ To that end, the Circle organized a series of lectures that was an education in itself. Leading Hungarian thinkers such as Oszkár Jászi and Sándor Ferenczi, as well as foreign scholars such as Max Adler, Robert Michels, Werner Sombart, Eduard Bernstein, and Wilhelm Ostwald, addressed the Galileoists.¹⁸ In addition to sponsoring these lectures, the Galileo Circle opened reading rooms, published a series of scholarly studies, and established the journal *Szabadgondolat* ("Free Thought"), primarily as a vehicle for younger scholars.¹⁹

Polanyi played an active role in the Circle's life, serving for a time as a member of the "Committee on Natural Science."²⁰ Yet,

while he was enthusiastic about the pursuit of scientific truth and certainly possessed the moral sensibility that was the animating force behind the Circle's scientific activity,²¹ he objected to the ever-increasing tendency on the part of his comrades to view scientific (especially social scientific) research as a weapon in the battle for social and political reform. Hence, while continuing to support the Circle's stated purposes, Polanyi seems to have drifted further and further away from its leaders, including his own brother.

Having completed his M.D. in 1913, Polanyi entered the Austro-Hungarian army as a medical officer on the outbreak of world war. Soon, however, he contracted diphtheria and, returning to the University, earned a Ph.D. in physical chemistry in 1917. By that time the cataclysmic character of the war was apparent to all Europeans and efforts to provide an explanation for its outbreak reflected a profound need to make sense of three years of unprecedented devastation—material and spiritual. In the summer of 1917, Polanyi contributed an article to *Huszadik Szazad* in which he discussed the causes of the war and the prospects for peace. The article was entitled: "To the Peacemakers: Views Concerning the Conditions of European War and Peace."²²

In this rare non-scientific essay, Polanyi argued that the war was not the result of a clash of economic interests, but rather of the almost religious idea of the sovereign state abiding in the hearts of the European peoples. "The war is bad business," he wrote. "The state, however, becomes engaged in war not as an association of interests, but as an idea; what is bad business for an association of interests, is health-giving nourishment for an idea. Business demands rational investments; an idea clamors for bloody sacrifices."

Polanyi acknowledged that his view could not be reconciled with the popular materialism of the day and would therefore call forth strenuous opposition. In an effort to anticipate objections, he faced the central issue squarely and assumed the offensive. The widespread disavowal of every preconception (to which, as we have seen, the Galileo Circle was committed) had not been wholly successful, "because these [preconceptions] are rooted in those tacit assumptions which govern our thinking without our being aware of it. This is why it is impossible to disavow them."²³ It was possible then, Polanyi continued, that twentieth-century thought was prisoner to materialistic preconceptions. The frequent assertion of such unexamined shibboleths as "the interest of the ruling classes," "war profiteers," "bureaucratic and military ambitions," and "economic expansion" constituted clear evidence that an unprejudiced social science did not exist.

In order to bring the war to an end and to prevent a renewal of hostilities, citizens of every state would have to become Europeans in the fullest sense of the word; they would have to abandon the idea of the sovereign state in favour of that of a unified Europe. Indeed, Polanyi insisted that civilization itself depended for its survival on the realization of the idea of a united Europe in which sovereignty was set above the individual nations. Unless that was accomplished, revolution would be inevitable, a revolution so terrible that it would soon reduce to insignificance the horror of the war. "Workers for peace! Only the creation of a European legal order can deliver us from revolution, because in its essence, the revolution of which everyone speaks is *the stirring of the peoples' conscience in an effort to free it from the idea of the state.*"

Anticipating Benda, who wrote in 1927 that "the progress of political passions in depth during the past century seems to me most remarkable in the case of national passions,"²⁴ Polanyi criticized the intellectuals for failing to take the lead in moderating nationalistic fervor. "Europe's intellectuals . . .," he wrote, "who speak equally well Europe's languages and whose spirit was nourished equally on every culture . . . one after another repudiated the internationalist ideal that was an animating force in the composition of their personalities."

Polanyi's counsel to the peacemakers was inspired by a concern for the precariousness of civilization and a conviction that the national passions that produced one war must not be allowed to call another into being; his essay did not betoken any taste for politics or political action. On the contrary, he regarded the blind national partisanship of the European intellectuals as a betrayal of their responsibility to defend civilization against internecine strife. And, precisely because the Galileo Circle had been captured by political radicals during the war, he apparently severed all ties with the organization, having found his way, in 1915, to a remarkable Sunday-afternoon discussion circle presided over by György (Georg) Lukács and Béla Balázs.²⁵ The subject for discussion at these gatherings was always chosen by Lukács and it invariably centered on some ethical problem or question suggested by the writings of Dostoevski and Kierkegaard. Politics and social problems were never discussed.²⁶ In a memoir concerning the "free school" organized by the circle in 1917, Balázs wrote: "There were eight or ten of us who never thought about politics even in our dreams."²⁷

The political aloofness cultivated by the Lukács-Balázs circle became increasingly difficult to maintain as time wore on, for in the closing months of 1918, Hungary entered one of the most critical periods in its thousand-year history. By conceding defeat in the Great

War, the military leaders of the Central Powers had sounded the death knell for the Hohenzollern and Habsburg monarchies and created an atmosphere of political uncertainty in *Mitteleuropa*. In Hungary, that uncertainty was not removed when, in late October, the liberal aristocrat Michael Károlyi led a bloodless revolution against the helpless old regime.²⁸ The Károlyi government sought to remake Hungary in the image of the Western democracies, but the enormous difficulties it faced made constructive action all but impossible. Locked in a vice by the victorious Allies and political enemies on the Right and the Left, Károlyi's democratic republic sank ever deeper in the quicksand of the post-war chaos while the Hungarian Communist Party, organized on November 24, 1918,²⁹ waited impatiently for its disappearance.

In the midst of this political maelstrom, most Hungarian intellectuals hastened to volunteer for political combat. Even Lukács and Balázs, to the dismay of their friends, joined the Communist Party.³⁰ Polanyi was a major exception. On February 1, 1919, less than two months before the fall of Károlyi's democratic regime and the establishment of Béla Kun's Soviet Republic, he published an article in *Szabadgondolat* entitled "New Skepticism."³¹ The essay was a searing indictment of the intellectuals' prostration before the altar of politics; it was the initial engagement in Polanyi's lifelong war on the politicized intelligentsia. So anomalous was the article in a journal whose pages rang with political debate, that its publication can only be explained by the fact that Karl Polanyi was then *Szabadgondolat's* editor-in-chief.

Polanyi began his essay by pointing out that before the world war, intellectuals had largely disdained politicians and political engagement. In the wake of the collapse of the old order, however, they had abandoned their position above the strife and descended into the political arena; they had begun to seek salvation through political faith. Such faith, according to Polanyi, was misguided and dangerous; modern society was so complex that not even the most talented social scientists, much less politicians, were able to calculate the future effects of any political innovation. Politics was the blind eruption of terror and hope; political struggles did not ensure historical progress, but only aimless destruction. Faith in politics was, therefore, faith in an illusion.

The authentic task of intellectuals living in a politicized world was to preserve culture and to shatter faith in politics. In place of the illusions engendered by that faith, the ancient tradition of the skeptics had to be revived. To be sure, illusions would never die, because their death, like that of kings, enthroned their successors. That is so because the causes of illusions, hope and fear, could never be laid to

rest. Yet, by fostering a spirit of political skepticism among the European peoples, intellectuals could contribute to the establishment of less dangerous illusions.

"Our work," Polanyi continued, "is the exploration of the truth." Intellectuals had to discover the origin of political illusions in order to dispel them. Once that task was accomplished, perhaps a real community could be built, grounded in political as well as personal self-restraint.³² Until then, intellectuals would have to regard politics as their enemy.

Polanyi's warning and counsel could not be heard above the shrill cries of political prophets and shortly after the formation of the Hungarian Soviet Republic in March 1919, he left Hungary for a life in exile.

II

I have dwelt at some length on Polanyi's years in Hungary because his early experience exerted a profound influence on his mature work; certainly they helped inspire him to discover the origin of political faith in man's moral nature. In contrast to most critics of the modern world, Polanyi does not think that ours is an age of moral weakness. On the contrary, "never in the history of mankind has the hunger for brotherhood and righteousness exercised such power over the minds of men as today."³³ The humanitarian reforms of the past two centuries embody in concrete form our moral sensibilities. And yet, something has gone wrong; the nineteenth century's dreams of continuous progress have turned into the twentieth century's nightmares. The political nihilism of Hitler and Stalin has shaken the edifice of civilization and ushered in an ice age of the human spirit.

Polanyi explains this paradox by analyzing what he has called "moral inversion." By that he means the process by which modern men have converted their moral passions into acts of manifest immorality in the search for perfection in society. They have done this because, while longing for an earthly paradise, their moral skepticism, engendered by "critical" thought since Descartes, forces them to conclude that all moral imperatives are mere epiphenomena without any legitimate claim to ontic status.

It is from this paradox that moral inversion springs. Man's moral impulse, Polanyi believes, is primal and cannot be successfully suppressed.³⁴ The more powerful that impulse and the less able it is to express itself through traditional channels, the more it will seek clandestine outlets. Embarrassed to be seen publicly, it disguises itself behind a mask of science or history; castigating the self-serving hypocrisy of "bourgeois" morality, it asserts its preeminence on grounds of its complete lack of self-deception and public duplicity.

Polanyi distinguishes between personal and political inversion,³⁵ the symbol of the former being the bohemian immoralist. Because of the totality of his contempt for all moral standards, the immoralist demands our respect and admiration. "I shall show you," he says, "an honesty as terrifying as it is pure. Like Smerdyakov, I shall follow to its logical conclusion Ivan Karamazov's 'everything is permitted' and shall taste those forbidden fruits before which you tremble with lust and fear of exposure. Your petty addiction to empty forms pales in moral significance beside my open decadence." It is on terms such as these that Simone de Beauvoir asks us to recognize in the Marquis de Sade our moral superior.³⁶

Obscene as this personal inversion is, Polanyi has reserved his most scathing attack for those intellectuals whose treason consists of being seduced by the "magic of Marxism," for they have helped to create and sustain a leviathan that has devoured millions of human beings and, what is perhaps worse, deprived millions of others of the last shred of human dignity.

What, precisely, is the magic that Marxism possesses? "The answer is," Polanyi writes, "that it enables the modern mind, tortured by moral self-doubt, to indulge its moral passions in terms which also satisfy its passion for ruthless objectivity."³⁷ While mocking the acknowledged moral concern of liberal reformers, Marx channeled his far more demanding moral passion into a scientific theory of historical inevitability. There is, in short, more morality to be found in Marx's monumental works than in all the works of liberals put together. So demanding and uncompromising is that morality that only a resort to violence can effect the realization of its imperatives. Thus, Marx the moralist becomes Marx the apologist for violence.

It is impossible, I think, to read much of Marx without becoming aware of his Old Testament moral fervor; indeed, many writers have called attention to the moral ground of Marx's doctrines. Polanyi's great contribution is to have shown precisely *how* the descent from lofty, if disguised, ideals to the abyss of nihilism logically proceeds. Because of his work, we now have a much clearer understanding of the treason of the intellectuals and a fuller appreciation for the agonizing efforts made by some of them to stand morality back on its feet.

That such efforts have been made by those intellectuals most sunk in the slough of political nihilism—the Stalinists—is the ground for Polanyi's conviction that twentieth-century man has now advanced "beyond nihilism." The turning point, he argues, came in 1956, the year in which the Poles and the Hungarians revolted against a system that proclaimed that truth was party truth and common decency the fossilized remains of bourgeois cynicism.

It is not by chance that Polanyi has singled out the Hungarian Revolution for especial analysis, for despite his many years in Germany and England, he has never severed spiritual ties with his native land. The dark years of the Rákosi dictatorship (1948-56) must have been a source of great pain to him and the Revolution of 1956 a proud moment. Again and again he has written of its crucial significance in the moral history of mankind.³⁸

The Revolution, Polanyi maintains, cannot be comprehended by social scientists committed to value-free descriptions, because it was generated by an analytically simple but existentially profound moral awakening among Hungarian communists. Any attempt to link the tumultuous events of October-November 1956 to some imagined social or economic change will end in a scholarly cul-de-sac; no such change induced the Hungarians to revolt. Rather, the rebel intellectuals finally recognized that they had betrayed systematically every moral principle for which they had originally alienated themselves from polite society. As two participants in the Revolution, Tamás Aczél and Tibor Méray, have written of their comrades: "The decisive impulse which flings the adventurers out of their usual course with such force into the opposite direction (sometimes with such force that they themselves hardly know where they have landed) is usually a moral impulse."³⁹

To be sure, many communists and fellow travelers, such as Koestler, Silone, and Gide, had recanted prior to 1956, but now the recantations came in the very heart of darkness—the Stalinist state; and from those whom that state had honored and rewarded.⁴⁰ Morally, the Hungarian communists are back on their feet and because in 1956 they were, metaphorically speaking, the embodiment of the world spirit, mankind can be said to have emerged from the dark cave of nihilism into the refracted sunlight of an imperfect but potentially decent world.

Polanyi insists, however, that a return to the moral status quo ante is not sufficient surety for a world ravaged by the effects of nihilistic politics. It is not enough, he argues, to restore rationalist enlightenment, since the logic of its demands for critical objectivity has been exposed as the fertile ground of nihilism. Rather, intellectuals must recognize that men are not machines whose task it is to reject all truth claims and moral postulates because they are incapable of objective verification, but moral agents who cannot set aside the burden and responsibility of personal commitment.

In one of the most challenging chapters of *Personal Knowledge*, "The Logic of Affirmation," Polanyi identifies his "post-critical philosophy" with that of St. Augustine.

We must now go back to St. Augustine to restore the balance of our cognitive powers. In the fourth century A.D., St. Augustine brought the history of Greek philosophy to a close by inaugurating for the first time a post-critical philosophy. He taught that all knowledge was a gift of grace, for which we must strive under the guidance of antecedent belief: *nisi credideritis, non intelligitis*.⁴¹

The similarities between the two thinkers are indeed striking. In common with St. Augustine, Polanyi has forged his philosophy in the crucible of a broken world, and like the great Church Father, he has offered an alternative to nihilistic despair rooted in a recognition of the fiduciary source of all knowledge. If twentieth-century intellectuals are to remain beyond nihilism, they must, in Polanyi's judgment, submit to intellectual and moral requirements which, while not scientifically demonstrable, are not for that reason merely the products of passing fancies, but the independent and universal determinants of authentic human existence.⁴²

NOTES

1. As a philosophic pathfinder, Polanyi has surprisingly much in common with Martin Heidegger. In at least one place, he has made explicit his accord with the great German thinker. *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1964), p. x.
2. *Ibid.*, p. ix.
3. Paul Ignotus, "The Hungary of Michael Polanyi," in *The Logic of Personal Knowledge: Essays Presented to Michael Polanyi on his Seventieth Birthday, 11th March 1961* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961), p. 12.
4. On the Polányi family, see Laura Fermi, *Illustrious Immigrants: The Intellectual Migration from Europe, 1930-41* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), pp. 113-15. Even more valuable, but in Hungarian, is Ilona Duczynska, "Polányi Károly (1886-1964)," *Századok*, 105, No. 1 (1971), 89-95. Ilona Duczynska is Mrs. Karl Polanyi.
5. Duczynska, "Polányi Károly," 89. Like many Hungarian Jews during the era of Dualism (1867-1918), Pollacsek chose to Magyarize his children's name (though not his own) to "Polányi," in the hope that their social and economic opportunities would thereby be greater.
6. *Ibid.*, 89-90.
7. The lifework of Karl Polanyi also bears the mark of Mihály Pollacsek's moral earnestness.
8. Pál Wolfner cited in Gyula Merei, *Polgári radikalizmus Magyarországon, 1900-1919* (Budapest, 1947), p. 10.
9. Exceptions include the poet János Arany (1817-82) and the painter Mihály Munkácsy (1844-1900).
10. Because Hungary's lyricists had traditionally been the pride of the nation, the sterility of Hungarian poetry at this time was particularly conspicuous. According to the perceptive critic and literary historian Aladár Schopflin (1872-1950), "The manner of our great classical poets became conventional in [fin de siècle] patriotic poetry. Generally, there was more patriotism . . . than poetry in this work." *A magyar irodalom története a XX. században* (Budapest: Grill Károly Könyvkiadóvállalata Kiadása, 1937), p. 57. In art, paintings of the Holy Family and portrayals of glorious historical events proliferated.

11. On Jászi and *Husadik Század*, see Merei, *Polgári radikalizmus Magyarországon* and my article, "The Moralist as Social Thinker: Oszkar Jaszi in Hungary, 1900-1919," in Walter Laqueur and George L. Mosse (eds.), *Historians in Politics* (London: Sage Publications, Ltd., 1974), pp. 273-313. On Ignóty and *Nyugat*, see Miksa Fenyő, "The *Nyugat* Literary Magazine and the Modern Hungarian Literature," *The Hungarian Quarterly*, III, No. 3-4 (1962), 7-28, and Andre Karatson, *Le Symbolisme en Hongrie* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1969).
12. On Bartók, see the excellent study by Halsey Stevens, *The Life and Music of Béla Bartók* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964); Krisztina Passuth, *A Nyolcak festészete* (Budapest: Athenaeum Nyomda, 1967) is an important study of the new art.
13. For an outstanding study of Széchenyi, see George Barany, *Stephen Széchenyi and the Awakening of Hungarian Nationalism, 1791-1841* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1968).
14. See my article, "Endre Ady's Summons to National Regeneration in Hungary, 1900-1919," *Slavic Review*, 33, No. 2 (1974), 302-22.
15. Polanyi has testified to his youthful identification with Hungarian liberalism in *The Tacit Dimension* (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1967), p. 86.
16. Ignóty, "The Hungary of Michael Polanyi," p. 12.
17. Márta Tömöry, *Új vizeken járok: A Galilei Kör története* (Budapest: Gondolat, 1960), photographic plate between pp. 48 and 49. On the formation of the Galileo Circle, see also Zsigmond Kende's posthumous memoir, *A Galilei Kör megalakulása*, ed. by Péter Hanák and György Litván (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1974).
18. For a complete list of these lectures, see Tömöry, *Új vizeken járok*, pp. 278-79.
19. The Galileo Circle received most of its financial support from the Hungarian Freemasons.
20. Tömöry, *Új vizeken járok*, p. 274. The mathematician George Polya served on the same committee.
21. Like Ady, with whom they established a close relationship, the Galileists sought the moral regeneration of Hungarian society. See Károly Polányi, "A Galilei Körre vonatkozó ismeretlen dokumentumok," ed. by Zoltán Horváth, *Századok*, 105, No. 1 (1971), 99-100.
22. Mihály Polányi, "A békeszerzőkhöz. (Nézetek az európai háború és béke felteteleiről)," *Husadik Század*, 2 (1917), 165-76.
23. Polanyi's later theory of tacit knowledge is here prefigured.
24. Julien Benda, *The Treason of the Intellectuals*, trans. by Richard Aldington (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1969), pp. 13-14.
25. Balázs Béla naplói: 1899-1922. Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára: Keziratár, Ms 5023/19, p. 47. December 22, 1915. On the Lukács-Balázs circle, see my article, "The Making of a Hungarian Revolutionary: The Unpublished Diary of Béla Balázs," *Journal of Contemporary History*, 8, No. 3 (1973), 57-74.
26. Interview with Professor Arnold Hauser in London, August 28, 1971. Hauser was a member of the circle.
27. Béla Balázs, *Válogatott cikkek és tanulmányok*, ed. by Magda K. Nagy (Budapest: Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1968), p. 91.
28. The best study of the October Revolution and the Károlyi government is still Sándor Juhász-Nagy, *A magyar októberi forradalom története (1918 okt. 31-1919 márc. 21)* (Budapest: Cserepfalvi, 1945). See also Oscar Jaszi, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Hungary* (Howard Fertig, Inc. ed.; New York: Howard Fertig, 1969) and Gábor Vermes, "The October Revolution in Hungary: From Károlyi to Kun," in Ivan Volgyes (ed.), *Hungary in Revolution, 1918-19* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971), pp. 31-60.
29. György Milei, "Mikor alakult a KMP?", *Párttörténeti Közlemények*, XI, No. 3 (1965), 140-41.

30. On Balázs, see my "The Making of a Hungarian Revolutionary"; on Lukács, see my article, "The Unexpected Revolutionary: Lukács's Road to Marx," *Survey*, 20, No. 2/3 (91/92) (1974), 176-205.
31. Mihály Polányi, "Új skepticismus," *Szabadgondolat*, February 1, 1919, pp. 53-56.
32. The theme of political skepticism and restraint is a recurring one in Polanyi's writings. He admires greatly the "suspended logic" of English political theory. For example, see Michael Polanyi, *Knowing and Being: Essays*, ed. by Marjorie Grene (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), pp. 22-23.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
34. Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge*, p. 234.
35. Polanyi, *Knowing and Being*, pp. 16-17; Michael Polanyi, "On the Modern Mind," *Encounter*, XXIV, No. 5 (1965), 19.
36. Simone de Beauvoir, *The Marquis de Sade: An Essay* (New York: Grove Press, 1953).
37. Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge*, p. 228.
38. See especially, Polanyi, "The Message of the Hungarian Revolution," in *Knowing and Being*, pp. 24-39.
39. Tamás Aczél and Tibor Méray, *The Revolt of the Mind* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1959), p. 325.
40. Tamás Aczél was a celebrated communist novelist and winner of both the Stalin and Kossuth Prizes; Tibor Méray was a highly-praised journalist-novelist and recipient of the Kossuth Prize.
41. Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge*, p. 266.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 300.

Hungarian Studies at American and Canadian Universities*

Steven Bela Vardy

According to a definition coined during the 1930's, when Hungary witnessed a major resurgence of the discipline known as Hungarology or Hungaristics /*Magyarságtudomány*/, Hungarian studies comprise "the sum of all knowledge pertaining to the Magyars". More specifically, "it is the science that concerns itself with the past, physical and spiritual makeup, intellectual values and the conditions of the natural existence of the Magyars. Thus, in addition to history, it comprises geography, ethnography, anthropology, literary and cultural history, as well as the study of all other manifestations of Magyar existence."¹

While this definition of Hungarian studies may not be the best, it is certainly as encompassing as any. But precisely because of its comprehensiveness, it is more suitable for the description of Hungarian studies in Hungary, where such an encompassing approach is both natural and feasible.

Naturally, the situation is quite different for Hungarian studies abroad. Due to the lack of adequate funding, unfavorable conditions and insufficient interest, Hungarian studies outside of Hungary have to be more limited in scope. Initially programs are usually limited to the study of the Magyar language, with perhaps some reference to literature, culture and history. Only later, with the growing evidence of demand and support do some of these initial efforts evolve into more comprehensive programs, that may entail courses in several related fields under the direction of a scholar-professor.

This pattern has generally been true for most of the Hungarian programs at North American colleges and universities, although only two evolved into respectable centers of Hungarian learning. The birth and development of programs depends on a number of frequently changing external factors. These factors generally include: (1) the

*I should like to thank the American Hungarian Studies Foundation of New Brunswick, N.J. for the Grant (1973) which made much of the research for the present study possible.

interests, needs and support of the American or Canadian Hungarian communities; (2) the interest and support of the Hungarian government; (3) and the needs and support of the American scholarly community and that of the U.S. or Canadian governments. The relative significance of these factors varied from time to time, and their impact also depended to a considerable degree on the role played by a few dedicated individual scholars at various times (e.g. Joseph Reményi in the U.S. and Watson Kirkconnell in Canada). The role of such scholars has been particularly significant during periods of disinterest on the part of the American and Canadian scholarly circles and the respective governments.

In addition to the above factors, the development of Hungarian studies in the U.S. and Canada also depended to a large degree on the maintenance of certain more encompassing area programs. The most significant of these were (and still are) the East European language and area programs, which have had a relatively high degree of popularity and support during the past twenty-five years. But the more limited Uralic and Altaic and Habsburg studies—which had their heyday in the late 1950's and 1960's—were also significant.

Types of Hungarian Studies Programs

In examining the development of Hungarian studies at American and Canadian colleges and universities, we find basically three types of programs, which on the whole correlate with the above-mentioned external factors. These include programs (1) which had been established and supported primarily by the Hungarians in North America, (2) those that enjoyed the financial and moral support of the Hungarian Government, and (3) those that were initiated by the American academic community, and at times supported by grants from various foundations or the U.S. Government. In the past, Hungarian studies programs have existed in all three of these categories, and their fate and fortune are good indicators of the relative interest and dedication of the above three factors in Hungarian studies.

The Pioneer Hungarian Studies Programs

The roots of Hungarian studies in the United States reach back to the early years of the twentieth century. They stretch back almost to the time when the pioneers of Russian and East European studies, professors Archibald Coolidge (1866-1928) and Leo Wiener (1862-1939), both of Harvard University, had turned the attention of American scholarship to the study of the East European world.

The first Hungarian program was initiated in 1904 in Bloomfield College and at the Bloomfield Theological Seminary in New Jersey,

where it continued until 1957. The primary purpose of this program was to educate Hungarian speaking ministers for the Hungarian Reformed and Evangelical Churches in the United States. Simultaneously, the college also provided English language training for theologians and theology students coming from Hungary.

A similar program also functioned at Franklin and Marshall College in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, between 1922 and 1936—apparently in the form of a separate Department of Hungarian Studies. Like the Bloomfield program, the Lancaster program also consisted of fundamental courses in language, literature, history and geography which stretched anywhere from two to eight semesters. The director of this program was the Rev. Dr. Alexander /Sándor/ Tóth, who also taught Hungarian at the nearby Lancaster Theological Seminary.

The third such program was initiated at Elmhurst College, near Chicago, Illinois, in 1941. Founded by the Rev. Dr. Barnabás Dienes, it also functioned as a separate Department of Hungarian Studies. After 1952 the department at Elmhurst College came under the direction of Professor August J. Molnár, who with others in 1955 established the American Hungarian Studies Foundation for the support and expansion of Hungarian studies programs in America. In 1959 this program was transferred to Rutgers University, where it functioned until its termination in 1965. In the meanwhile, the American Hungarian Studies Foundation (renamed American Hungarian Foundation in 1974) expanded its activities and support to include numerous other Hungarian academic programs and individual scholars. Thus, in the course of the past two decades (1955-1975), the Foundation has distributed over \$300,000 in grants and fellowships.

All three of the above pioneer college programs fell into the first category of Hungarian studies, in that they were supported primarily by the Hungarian Protestant churches in America, and they reflected the needs and aspirations of pre-World War II Hungarian immigrants and of their descendants in the United States. These programs also reflected the dedication of their founders and directors who struggled continuously to keep them going even in the face of various adverse circumstances.

The role and support of the American Hungarian community in Hungarian studies programs during the interwar period is also reflected by the University of Dubuque, Iowa, in the 1920's; the Central Theological Seminary of Dayton, Ohio, in the late 1920's and early 1930's; the Bridgeport Junior College of Bridgeport, Connecticut, from 1926 to 1931; and perhaps several other similar programs, most of which were composed of elementary language courses, with some aspects of Hungarian culture.

The situation appears to have been different with the Hungarian language programs that functioned off and on at Columbia and Harvard Universities during the 1920's and 1930's. In these two instances the needs of the American scholarly community seemed to converge with the desire of the Hungarian Government to support selected Hungarian programs abroad. During the mid-1920's Hungarian was taught at Columbia University by the visiting lecturer László Tápay-Szabó, and subsequently by the Rev. Dr. Géza Takaró, who also covered Hungarian literature, history and cultural history. Finally in 1939, a permanent Hungarian lectureship was established there by the Hungarian Government. This Columbia University lectureship functioned only for a few years under the direction of Joseph Szentkirályi (St. Clair), for the American-Hungarian belligerency in World War II terminated Hungary's financial support.

It deserves to be mentioned that the Columbia University lectureship was a byproduct of the comprehensive cultural and educational policy of interwar Hungary aimed at the formation of public opinion favorable to the revision of the Treaty of Trianon (1920). Initiated in the early 1920's by Count Kunó Klebelsberg (1875-1932), and continued by the historian Bálint Hóman (1885-1951) in their capacity as Hungary's ministers for culture and education, this policy was quite well served by the establishment and support of various centers of Hungarian learning in Europe. In the United States, however, it hardly went beyond the foundation of the Hungarian lectureship at Columbia University.

Although in a different sense, the scholarly activities of Professor Joseph Reményi (1891-1956) at Western Reserve University in Cleveland, and of Professor Watson Kirkconnell (b. 1895) at several Canadian colleges and universities were also of utmost significance throughout the interwar and post-World War II periods. Their activities were more significant in the area of publishing on Hungarian literature and culture, than in teaching, which was limited by the lack of sufficient demand. Both Kirkconnell and Reményi were motivated primarily by their scholarly interest, although they both maintained close contact with the Canadian and American Hungarian communities, as well as with scholarly and cultural circles in Hungary.

As we survey the development and achievements of Hungarian studies in North America prior to the golden age of this discipline during the quarter of a century following World War II, we find that all of the college and university programs were of rather limited scope and of modest quality. Even the most comprehensive of them were limited to basic language studies, with perhaps the selective inclusion of some literary, historical and geographical studies—all given by the same professor, who at best was a specialist in only one of these fields.

Next to offering the basics of Hungarian language and culture, the main function of most of these pioneer programs appears to have been to supply the Hungarian Protestant Churches in America with the needed number of clergymen. The preparation of prospective area scholars was a secondary goal, and then it was limited to such institutions as Columbia and Harvard, where future East Europeanists may also have wished to gain some familiarity with the Magyar language and culture. This situation remained unchanged until after World War II, when the sudden emergence of the Soviet Union as one of the two super powers and the controlling influence in East Central Europe, made it necessary for the U.S. Government to support the quantitative and qualitative improvement of East European, and therein Hungarian studies.

The Golden Age of Hungarian Studies (1945-1970)

In addition to the general rise of interest in Russia and East Central Europe during and after World War II, the specific factors that have contributed to the rise of Hungarian studies in America during the 1940's and 1950's include: (1) The birth of a number of intensive language programs during the war, which were inspired by considerations of national security (e.g. the Army Language School of Monterey, California, the Indiana University Air Force Language School in Bloomington, Indiana, and the Foreign Service Institute of Washington, D.C.); (2) the rise of American structural linguistics and the creation of two major and several smaller Uralic and Altaic programs at a number of American universities; (3) the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 and the consequent establishment of four Uralic and Altaic (Columbia, Indiana, Berkeley, Colorado) and a number of Russian and East European Language and Area Centers; and finally (4) the rise of Habsburg studies during the late 1950's and 1960's.

The above factors have all contributed to the rise and development of Hungarian studies on a much higher scholarly level than before World War II—reaching their climax during the 1960's. After a quarter century of qualitative and quantitative improvement, however, around 1970 there began a noticeable decline. This decline was due partially at least to the general economic crisis in the Western World that dried up many of the formerly available financial sources. It was also due, however, to the senseless "over-production" in the field of East European studies, the progressive liquidation of the Cold War, and the simultaneous decline in the need for East European area specialists. As a result, severe cutbacks occurred in several respectable Hungarian studies programs and others were simply abolished. Some of the small programs which came into existence in the late 1960's and

early 1970's in consequence of the so-called "ethnic revolution" somehow survived. Interest in ethnicity in a pluralistic society brought them into existence, keeps them going, and also determines to a considerable degree their general tone and makeup. The most significant of these types of programs is the yet-to-be discussed Cleveland State University Hungarian studies program founded in 1969.

In light of the decline and disappearance of a number of significant Hungarian programs during the past few years, it is perhaps justifiable to include in this survey not only the currently functioning programs, but also those that have been discontinued or suspended recently. While they functioned, they all had a considerable influence on the spread of Hungarian language and culture in the United States and Canada, even though they were rather unequal in scope and uneven in quality. Content and quality-wise they range from such comprehensive and interdisciplinary programs as those at Columbia and Indiana Universities (involving scores of Hungarian and Hungarian-related courses, and perhaps a dozen or more scholars from various fields) to a number of simple programs composed only of one or two basic language courses, at times taught by non-professional native speakers.

The Two Leading Hungarian Studies Centers: Columbia and Indiana

Comprehensive interdisciplinary Hungarological programs on a high scholarly level have developed only at two universities: Columbia University in New York City and Indiana University at Bloomington, Indiana. Of these two universities, Columbia pioneered Hungarian studies, providing the same level of excellence that characterized the university at large. But ultimately it was Indiana that developed the most encompassing program. Moreover, today Indiana University's program is the only remaining American Hungarological center; and it is also the only remaining NDEA Language and Area Center in Uralic and Altaic studies supported by the U.S. Government.

Both at Columbia and at Indiana University, the Hungarian studies programs have developed in conjunction with two significant area studies programs, involving numerous departments. At Columbia the Hungarian area studies were an integral part of the Uralic Language and Area Center (1959-1965), which since 1965 is the Subcommittee on Uralic Studies, and the Institute on East Central Europe. At Indiana the Hungarian program came to be based largely in the Department of Uralic and Altaic Studies (the only one of its kind in the Americas), and partially in the Russian and East European Institute. The disciplines involved in these two programs vary slightly, but they generally include anthropology, economics, educa-

tion, Finnology, geography, government, history, international relations, law, linguistics, music, Slavistics, sociology, Turkology, as well as a number of other fields, including a great number of East Central European and Uralic and Altaic languages and literatures. While the program at Columbia declined in recent years the program at Indiana has remained substantially intact. In addition to scores of related area courses, the program at Indiana is also distinguished by the fact that—among the sixty-plus languages offered by the university—it teaches over a dozen Uralic and Altaic languages.

Hungarian Studies at Columbia University

Before its recent contraction, Columbia University's Hungarian studies program used to offer between fifteen to twenty semesters of specifically Hungarian courses. These included offerings in the Magyar language, philology, literature, history and proto-history. During the late 1950's and early 1960's, when Columbia University became one of the four NDEA Uralic and Altaic Language and Area Centers (1958-1965), its Hungarian program was particularly strong in linguistics. Later, with the decline and eventual elimination of the whole linguistics program, the emphasis shifted to literature and history.

In addition to some of the interwar attempts, the origins of the Columbia University Hungarian program go back to 1947, when—in conjunction with the rapidly expanding East European program, that soon resulted in two distinct institutes (Russian and East Central European)—Professor John Lotz (1913-1973) was appointed to the Department of Linguistics. Professor Lotz soon developed the nascent Hungarian studies into a respectable program, in conjunction with the newly founded Department of Uralic and Altaic Languages (1953-1965), and also produced several excellent scholars to continue his work. Without aiming at completeness, some of the noted linguists and literary scholars who at one or another time were associated with the Columbia University Hungarian program include Robert Austerlitz, Elemér Bakó, Francis S. Juhász, Kálmán Keresztes, Albert Tezla and others. Following Professor Lotz's retirement from Columbia in 1967 (when he became the director of the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, D.C.), the major burden of carrying on the linguistic aspects of Hungarian studies at the institution fell to his former student, Professor Robert Austerlitz; while the Hungarian language and literature courses were taught by various resident lecturers and visiting literary scholars. The latter also included the noted poet György Faludy (b. 1910). At the present Hungarian language is taught by Francis Juhász and János Latin. Dr. Juhász also offers courses in linguistics.

In the area of social sciences, the burden of Hungarian studies has been borne primarily by Professor István Deák who, since 1967, is also the director of the Institute on East Central Europe. Ever since his first appointment at Columbia in 1963, Professor Deák has made an effort to extend offerings in Hungarian history. This also involved the periodic appointment of such visiting scholars from Hungary as Drs. Péter Hanák, Domokos Kosáry and Zsuzsa Nagy. Unfortunately, the general economic decline, the retirement and death of Professor Lotz, and the sagging interest in East European studies had an adverse effect on area programs at Columbia. The formerly impressive Hungarian program had deteriorated considerably, along with the decline and contraction of the sponsoring Uralic and East Central European programs. Yet, the presence of Professors Austerlitz, Deák and Tibor Halasi-Kun (Turkic studies), and such other scholars as F. Juhász and J. Latin keep the remaining program at a respectable level. Moreover, should circumstances change favorably, the Columbia University Hungarian program could again develop into a full-scale center of Hungarian studies.

Hungarian Studies at Indiana University

The Hungarian studies program at Indiana University has been more fortunate than its counterpart at Columbia University, and today it is the only federally supported comprehensive Hungarological center in North America. Moreover, while it also felt the negative pressures exerted on programs considered of low priority at a time of diminishing funding, the Indiana University program still retains much of the coverage, quality and vitality that used to be its mark during the 1960's. This is due to a large degree to the dedicated and effective leadership of Professor Denis Sinor, the chairman of the Department of Uralic and Altaic Studies, without whose efforts the Indiana University Hungarian program would also have suffered considerably.

Hungarian studies at Indiana University reach back to the period of World War II, and more specifically to the Air Force Language School established there for the teaching of rare, but strategically important languages. This was soon followed by the development of an increasingly comprehensive East European studies program, which soon grew into an East European Institute (1951), and then into an even more comprehensive Russian and East European Institute (1959). Initiated by Professor James F. Clarke in 1951, and then restructured and directed by Professor Robert F. Byrnes in 1959, this institute ultimately developed into one of the three leading Russian and East European study and research centers in the United States, which at times was manned by over fifty teaching and research scholars. Moreover,

in the area of East Central European and Hungarian studies, it was rivalled only by Columbia University's Institute on East Central Europe.

Parallel with the rise of East European studies at Indiana University, the Uralic and Altaic program also developed from its World War II roots. For a considerable time it functioned under the leadership of Professor Thomas Sebeok, who developed it into an increasingly complex linguistically oriented program. Then in 1963, Indiana University was made into one of the NDEA-sponsored Uralic and Altaic Language and Area Centers under the chairmanship of Professor Denis Sinor. Two years later the program was transformed into a full-fledged department.

As it stands, the Indiana University Hungarological program is part of the only Department of Uralic and Altaic Studies and the only surviving NDEA Uralic and Altaic Language and Area Center in the United States. Moreover, it is also the only Hungarian studies program which—in addition to offering the traditional M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in various aspects of Uralic and Altaic studies—also offers a Certificate of Hungarian Studies, either independently, or in conjunction with one of the advanced degrees. Furthermore, the program also offers a wide variety of courses both on the undergraduate and graduate level.

The course requirements for the Certificate of Hungarian Studies vary between thirty-one and thirty-four semester credit hours beyond basic language courses. The requirements include advanced courses in the Magyar language, history, literature, linguistics and various elective courses in anthropology, economics, folklore, geography, government, music and a number of other fields. Moreover, the requirements include an examination of the candidate's reading and oral proficiency in Hungarian, a written comprehensive examination on the material covered in the course work, and a research thesis or essay on a specific topic prepared partially in conjunction with a required seminar in Hungarian studies. Candidates for the Certificate in Hungarian Studies generally, but not necessarily, combine their work with study for one of the advanced degrees in the Department of Uralic and Altaic Studies, in the Russian and East European Institute, or in one of the numerous relevant departments of the University.

Despite certain cutbacks in funding, the Russian and East European Institute is still manned by about forty scholars, with about 130 semesters of courses, and the Department of Uralic and Altaic Studies by sixteen scholars, who offer over 100 semesters of course work. Of the scholars, several are of Hungarian birth (i.e. Professor Denis Sinor, Thomas Sebeok and Gustav Bayerle), and two others, who

have received part of their training in Hungary at the intellectually exclusive Eötvös College of the University of Budapest, also speak Hungarian (i.e. Professors Alo Raun and Felix Oinas). Moreover, the department has constant Hungarian visiting language instructors (e.g. Tamás Radványi for 1973-1975), and often also noted visiting professors from Hungary and Germany (e.g. Professors Gyula Décsy from Germany, and Professors Edmond Schultz, Barnabás Csongor, Károly Czeglédy, András Róna-Tas and others from Hungary). No less is it significant that noted Hungarian-born professors also offer courses in several related departments and disciplines (e.g. Professors Linda Dégh in folklore, Andrew Vázsony in Language Sciences, and János Starker and Tibor Kozma in music, etc.). All in all, despite the difficulties of the 1970's, the Indiana University program in Hungarian studies is still a comprehensive one, and it offers undoubtedly the best preparation for a prospective Hungarian area specialist in North America.

Military and Diplomatic Schools

As the rise of these two leading Hungarian studies programs was considerably influenced by the federally supported military and diplomatic schools developed during World War II, we cannot bypass the latter—even though they do not fit into the traditional category of “college and university”.

The most significant of these schools is undoubtedly the Defense Language Institute (DLI), which came into being in 1963 through the unification of the Army Language School at Monterey, California, and the Language Department of the Naval Intelligence School at Washington, D.C. These two institutions became respectively the West Coast Branch and the East Coast Branch of the DLI.

The teaching of Hungarian has generally been limited to the more significant West Coast Branch of the DLI at Monterey, which for two decades functioned as the Army Language School, and where some of the revolutionary methods of language teaching have been developed under the direction of professional linguists and competent native speakers. Some of the Hungarian linguists who have contributed to the development of the Hungarian program at Monterey included Professors B.C. Maday, J.S. Nyikos and J. St. Clair /Szentkirályi/. Professor Maday, currently of American University, was the chairman of the Hungarian Section during the early 1950's; while Professor St. Clair, formerly of Columbia University, has headed the section during the 1960's and 1970's.

During the past two decades Hungarian has been taught at two different levels at the Monterey branch of the DLI. The first level consists of a forty-seven week “Basic Course”, and the second level of

a thirty-seven week "Aural Comprehension Course". The former carries a maximum undergraduate credit recommendation of twenty-one hours, and the latter fifteen hours. In addition to speaking and aural fluency in the Magyar language, DLI students also acquire some background in Hungarian history, geography, economy and politics.

While it functioned, Hungarian language training at the Indiana University Air Force Language School was basically identical with the training at the Army Language School at Monterey. Apparently, this was not quite true for the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) at Washington, D.C. Established in 1947 as a direct successor to the Foreign Service School (or Foreign Service Officers' Training School) for the purposes of providing background and language training to the professional members of the American diplomatic corps, the FSI is composed of several specialized schools. These include the schools of language and area studies, to which over half of the institute's resources are allocated. But as testified to by a number of official reports, the FSI's achievements during the 1960's were less than favorable. While its achievement level has undoubtedly improved in recent years, in the teaching of languages (including Hungarian) it does not seem to be on par with the West Coast Branch of the DLI. The FSI, however, was responsible for the development and publication of language textbooks for over two dozen languages, which are generally highly regarded both by teachers and students. The FSI's Hungarian textbooks and readers are used by a number of universities.

Recently Terminated and Still Functioning Smaller Programs

Next to the two leading centers of Hungarian learning in the United States—Columbia and Indiana Universities—the other Hungarian college and university programs were of modest scope and quality. Several promising programs of only a few years ago have lost their vitality, and have either abandoned, suspended or at least reduced their offerings considerably. These formerly promising centers include such institutions as the University of California at Berkeley, Rutgers University, the University of Washington in Seattle, as well as the State University of New York College at Buffalo, which was part of a consortium with the State University of the same city. While none of these institutions had extensive offerings in Hungarian studies, these studies frequently had the advantage of being connected with noted universities, and in some instances with significant centers of Central and East European studies.

Up to 1973, the University of California at Berkeley program consisted of eleven semesters of course work in language and litera-

ture, which was supplemented by various related area courses from a wide variety of fields on Central and Eastern Europe, offered by a number of departments of the university. After several years of successful work, this program came to a halt in 1973 as a result of the termination of those external funds that supported it. Subsequently, Dr. Lóránt Czigány, the director of this program, returned to another academic post in England.

The Hungarian program at the State University of New York College at Buffalo functioned between the years 1969 and 1973 under the direction of Professor Joseph Értavy-Baráth. It consisted of a few basic courses in Hungarian language and literature, and was aided by various related courses offered in the East European program of the Buffalo consortium. Professor Értavy-Baráth's departure from the university in 1973 terminated the Hungarian program, save for the language courses, which may be offered occasionally on a tutorial basis. Its most lasting achievement appears to have been the initiation of a monograph series with the financial support of the Hungarian Cultural Foundation, also headed by Professor Értavy-Baráth. This series has already six published volumes on Hungarian topics, with an additional twenty-plus volumes in various stages of preparation.

Contrary to the situation at California-Berkeley and Buffalo, the Hungarian program at Rutgers University and the University of Washington in Seattle have not been officially terminated. Due to a lack of interest and perhaps financial problems, they both appear to be in a state of suspended animation. While theoretically they still offer Hungarian language courses, in practice these courses seldom materialize. Courses on the history, politics and culture of the Danubian Area (if not on Hungary specifically), are still available at both of these universities.

After the termination of an earlier Hungarian program at Rutgers University under Professor August J. Molnar, a new program was started in 1965 by Professor Joseph Held. During the late 1960's and early 1970's, this program consisted of basic Hungarian language and history courses, with additional related courses offered by such noted historians as P. Charanis, R. Kann, and T. Stoianovich, and more recently by G. Vermes at the university's Newark campus.

The Hungarian program at the University of Washington in Seattle is connected with the scholarly activities of two Hungarian born historians, Professors Peter Sugar and Imre Boba. Moreover, it is part of one of the strongest programs on East Central Europe. Despite the University's strength in East Central Europe, however, the University of Washington's Hungarian offerings never developed into a comprehensive program. Thus outside of a few basic language courses, it consisted largely of area courses, rather than specific

Hungarian course offerings. It seems that the current crisis in American East European studies had an adverse effect also on the East European program of the University of Washington.

Of the still functioning small but meaningful Hungarian programs, the most significant include the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), Portland State University, and Cleveland State University. Though different in character, they all are basically one man programs.

The Hungarian program at UCLA is composed of eight semesters of course work under the direction of Dr. Marianna Birnbaum. Interestingly, the courses include not only the customary offerings in language and literature, but also Hungarian folklore and mythology. Moreover, in addition to the advantages of being part of a major university, with significant East European and other related offerings, this is the only Hungarian program—outside of its more extensive counterparts at Indiana and Columbia—that is also part of a small Finno-Ugric studies program.

The situation at Portland State University is slightly different in that the local Hungarian program is connected with a Central European Studies Center which, on the undergraduate level, has been rated in the past as one of the best in the country.

The Portland Hungarian program is directed by Professor Louis J. Éltető and it offers two years of basic language courses, two semesters of literature, and occasionally some additional tutorial courses on a higher level. In 1974, the university has also initiated an intensive summer institute, which is composed essentially of the above courses. It is equally significant that since 1973—similarly to some of the larger programs—it also has a special exchange arrangement with Hungary, which permits American students to spend a year at the University of Szeged.

Cleveland: The Special Case

The Hungarian program at Cleveland State University is in many ways different from all other similar programs in the United States. This difference is due partially to the makeup of the local Hungarian community (which has generally been one of the largest, most compact and ideologically most conservative of all Hungarian settlements in North America), and partially to the fact that the current program is based largely on second generation Hungarians who come from this community.

The history of Hungarian studies in Cleveland reach back to the professorial activities of the already mentioned Joseph Reményi at Western Reserve University (1926-1956). Professor Reményi taught Hungarian literature in his comparative literature courses, and

promoted the cause of Hungarian culture through his extensive literary activities.

In the early 1950's Professor Reményi's work in Cleveland was complemented by the establishment of the St. Stephen Free University that functioned for three years under Professor Ferenc Somogyi's direction. It offered courses in a wide variety of fields, including Hungarian history, legal history, literary history, linguistics, geography, ethnography and on several aspects of Hungarian law. At the time of its foundation, the goal was to make the St. Stephen University an integral part of John Carroll University of Cleveland—in imitation of several so-called "free universities" of the interwar and post-World War II era in Europe. Due to the lack of sufficient interest on the part of prospective students, however, this plan eventually failed to materialize.

During the 1960's, Professor Reményi's work at Western Reserve University was continued by Professor Ferenc Somogyi. With funding and support from the American Hungarian Studies Foundation Professor Somogyi introduced a seminar in Hungarian cultural history that functioned between 1962 and 1967. During the same period, Western Reserve University also offered courses in Hungarian language, taught by Dr. Ilona Vassko.

In 1969 the center of Hungarian studies in Cleveland has shifted from Western Reserve University to Cleveland State University. This new program was established by Professor Robert Oszlányi within the Department of Modern Languages, in the wake of the so-called "ethnic revolution" that surfaced about that time. Subsequently the university also developed a modest East European studies program up to the level of an M.A. degree. As it stands, the Cleveland State University Hungarian program is composed of two academic years or six quarters of general Hungarian literature, history and culture (simply called "Hungarian"), and two quarters each of composition and conversation, literature in translation and readings in Hungarian literature. Additional work may also be taken under the classification of "independent study". All courses are offered by Professor Oszlányi, and the majority of them are geared to second generation Hungarians who already have some command of the Magyar language.

In addition to its heavy reliance upon second generation Hungarians, the Cleveland program appears to be different from all of the above-mentioned Hungarian programs also in that it has an intimate relationship with the local Hungarian community and seems to reflect the relatively conservative political philosophy of the post-1945 immigrants. Perhaps for this very reason—and in contradistinc-

tion to all other Hungarian programs—the Cleveland program has no official contact with scholarly institutions in Hungary.*

We might add that in recent years the Cuyahoga County Community College of Cleveland also tried to offer courses in Hungarian, but apparently without much success.

Hungarian Studies in Pittsburgh

Of the remaining universities that had offered Hungarian language courses during the past few years, only the University of Pittsburgh and American University of Washington, D.C. had the potential to develop these courses into more encompassing programs. At the present, however, only Pittsburgh still offers some Hungarian language courses in the Department of Linguistics. These are basic introductory and intermediate courses which are handled by William /Béla/ Biró and Melinda Besskó.

While due largely to the lack of sufficient interest, a Hungarian program has never developed in Pittsburgh beyond simple language courses, instruction in Magyar had already been offered during the 1930's by Dr. Clara Fetter. During World War II Pittsburgh also had an Army Language School that emphasized Balkan languages, but it did not survive the war. Since the early 1960's, East Central European studies have been well represented by the consortium composed of the University of Pittsburgh, Duquesne University and Chatham College. Jointly, these three institutions offer dozens of related courses in such diverse fields as history, literature, political science, economics, anthropology and even music. However, most of the Hungarian-related courses are in history and are taught by Professors James F. Clarke (a specialist in Byzantine and Balkan history), S.B. Vardy (who offers several courses in East Central European, Habsburg and Ottoman political and social history), and Stephen Borsody (who specializes in the region's twentieth-century developments). Courses in Hungarian music—including the "Kodály method"—are offered both at Duquesne University (Professor L. Munkácsy and C. Kunko) and at the University of Pittsburgh (Professor D. Bartha). Duquesne University is also the home of the Tamburitza Institute of Folk Art, which specializes in East Central and Southeast European folk art and folk music, and has an internationally recognized folk ensemble that also performs Hungarian dances. At the present plans are also under way for an interinstitutional and multidisciplinary

*Following Professor Oszlanyi's illness and subsequent retirement, the direction of the Hungarian Program at Cleveland State University was assumed by Professor Theofil Lant of the Department of German of that institution. Dr. Lant is already making contacts with scholarly circles in Hungary.

seminar in Hungarian culture and civilization, to be offered jointly by a number of specialists (e.g. W. Biró in geography, E. Chászár in political science, L. Munkácsy in music, M. Sózán in anthropology and folklore, A.H. Várdy in literature and S.B. Várdy in history). Pittsburgh is also the center of a number of scholarly journals in the area, some of which have relevance to Hungarian studies (e.g. *East Central Europe*, *Southeastern Europe*, *Byzantine History*, as well as the older *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*). They are all under the general editorship of Charles Schlacks Jr. from the University Center for International Studies at the University of Pittsburgh.

Past and Current Programs from Washington, D.C. to Colorado

Hungarian studies at the University in Washington, D.C. never reached program status, although Professor Béla C. Maday has been offering various related courses in the Anthropology Department and in the School of International Services for over a decade. These courses inspired a number of Ph.D. candidates to concentrate on Hungarian studies. The American University has also offered Hungarian language courses in alternating years. For a while these courses were taught by Dr. András Sándor, and more recently by Dr. Enikő M. Basa who also introduced an interdisciplinary course in Hungarian civilization. But due to low level of student interest, these courses are offered only irregularly.

During the past few years Hungarian language courses have also been offered at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, Ohio University in Athens, Colgate University in Hamilton, N.Y., and Purdue University's extension center at Calumet, Indiana. But of these language course offerings only Stony Brook has managed to maintain itself, with the support of the American Hungarian Studies Foundation. In most instances they were lacking the social and institutional backing for the development of more comprehensive Hungarian programs.

The situation was considerably different at the University of Colorado, at Cornell University and at Georgetown University, where Hungarian was also taught for a number of years after World War II. Due to a wide variety of related course offerings at these universities, they might have developed comprehensive programs in Hungarian studies.

The institution that came closest to the development of such a program was the University of Colorado, which for seven years had one of four U.S. government sponsored NDEA Uralic and Altaic Language and Area Center (1958-1965). During most of this period, the Hungarian language instruction was under the direction of Dr.

Charles Wojatsek, supported by the university's program in East Central Europe. The latter was established during the interwar period by Professor S. Harrison Thomson (b. 1895), one of the great pioneers of East Central European studies in the United States, who had also established and edited the first significant American scholarly journal of the area, the *Journal of Central European Affairs* (1941-1964).

At the present, the University of Colorado's program in East Central Europe is under the direction of Professor Stephen Fischer-Galati, the founding editor of both the *East European Quarterly* (1967-) and the "East European Monographs" series (1970-). Currently, courses in Hungarian are not offered by the university.

The "Kodály Method" in America

While perhaps not in the main line of Hungarian studies, mention should be made of the work of the Kodály Musical Training Institute (KMTI) at Wellesley, Massachusetts. Founded in 1969 with the assistance of the Ford Foundation, the KMTI is a non-profit educational corporation whose mission is "to develop an authentic adaptation of the Kodály concept for the use in American schools."²

The Kodály method is also taught at Duquesne University, the University of Pittsburgh, Indiana University, as well as at Holy Names College in Oakland, California. In August of 1973, the latter institution hosted the "First Kodály International Symposium" with the participation of over sixty delegates from sixteen countries. Moreover, in September of that year, Holy Names College instituted a new Masters of Music Education Degree, with an emphasis on the Kodály method.

Hungarian Studies in Canada

While Hungarian immigration to Canada has been considerable, Hungarian studies programs at Canadian institutions of higher learning have never been able to compete with their counterparts in the United States. Moreover, prior to 1964 no Hungarian program at the university level seems to have existed in Canada. The scholarly activities of Professor Watson Kirkconnell, reaching back to the 1920's, were, of course, very significant; and his scholarly output in the area of translating and interpreting Hungarian literature for the English speaking world is probably without parallel. But he never managed (or perhaps never intended) to establish a Hungarian program. Thus, the first Canadian Hungarian studies program was established only in 1964 at Montreal's Loyola College under the direction of Dr. Dezső Heckenast. It was sponsored by Canada's Széchenyi Society and comprised basic courses in Hungarian language, literature

and history. The Loyola program functioned for six years (1964-1970), in the course of which it had about 250 registered students in one or another of its courses. Even so, by 1970 it was terminated, partially because of a lack of sufficient interest, and partially because the Széchenyi Society terminated its financial support.

Since then plans have been under way to create an endowed chair of Hungarian studies at the University of Toronto, which sponsors perhaps Canada's most significant program on East Central Europe. The latter even contains a course on the "History of Modern Hungary and Czechoslovakia", which is given by the noted Polish specialist, Peter Brock. If and when established, the proposed chair of Hungarian studies will undoubtedly serve as an intellectual center for the study of Hungarian language, literature, history and culture on a scholarly level. But this will require an endowment of about \$575,000, and the current fund drive is still far from its goal.

While currently no Hungarian studies program exists at any of the Canadian universities, several institutions have programs in Central and East European studies. Some of these have Hungarian area specialists, or at least scholars who are interested in aspects of Hungarian developments attached to them. The most significant of these include the University of Toronto (Professors Bennett Kovrig, Peter Brock, Scott M. Eddie and H.G. Skilling), Carleton University in Ottawa (Professor Philip E. Uren) and the University of British Columbia (Professor János Bak). Other scholars in the field of Hungarian studies, working in isolation, include Professors Nándor F. Dreisziger (Royal Military College of Canada at Kingston), Louis A. Fischer (McGill University's Macdonald College), Alexander Fodor (McGill University), Peter Hidas (Dawson College at Montreal), Martin L. Kovács (University of Regina), László László (Concordia University at Montreal), Pál Pilisi (Université du Québec at Chicoutimi), Géza de Rohan (University of Western Ontario), Thomas Spira (University of Prince Edward Island), Charles Wojatsek (Bishop's University), and a number of others. Of these scholars, Professor Dreisziger is the editor of the *Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies*, and Professor Spira is the editor of the *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism—Revue Canadienne des Études sur le Nationalisme*. Professor Kovács, who is known for his work on early Hungarian settlements in Saskatchewan, has treated Hungarian history and culture in several of his courses. Starting with the fall semester of 1975, Professor Fodor of McGill University will teach a course on Hungarian literature.

It should also be mentioned that, in imitation of several American universities, in 1974 McMaster University of Hamilton, Ontario, has initiated an exchange program with the Hungarian Institute of

Cultural Relations in Budapest. But as McMaster University has no Hungarian-related studies, this program is limited primarily to the exchange of scholars in the physical and natural sciences.

Potential Hungarian Studies Programs in North America

According to a survey prepared by Professor Piotr S. Wandycz of Yale University under the sponsorship of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS), in 1970 there were over thirty strong or at least good Russian and East Central European programs in North America. Of these all but two—those at the universities of Toronto and Ottawa—were in the United States. In addition to the most significant institutions already mentioned in conjunction with some of the Hungarian programs (i.e. California-Berkeley, Columbia, Harvard, Indiana, Pittsburgh, UCLA and Washington-Seattle), some of the other respectable East European programs were located at the University of Chicago, Duke University, Georgetown University, the University of Illinois, University of Kansas, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, University of North Carolina, University of Notre Dame, Ohio State University, Princeton University, Vanderbilt University, University of Wisconsin and Yale University. While this list is not complete and the changing conditions of the early 1970's have undoubtedly altered the content of some of these programs, given a favourable turn of events, all of these universities have the potential to support strong programs in East Central Europe, with considerable attention to Hungarian studies. Some of these institutions and programs also have scholars on their faculties who specialize in, or at least have some interest in Hungarian history and culture (e.g. K. Hitchins and P. Schroeder at Illinois, G. Kiss at Michigan, W.O. McCagg at Michigan State, S. Kertész and A. Gábríel at Notre Dame, and many more). This holds also true for the institutions listed in the first group where, in addition to the already mentioned scholars of Hungarian birth, there are such historians and political scientists who study aspects of Hungary and its neighboring lands as A.C. János and W.B. Slottman at California-Berkeley, Barbara and Charles Jelavich and H.B. Kaplan at Indiana, R.L. Wolf and P. Magocsi at Harvard, and a number of others.

There are of course numerous other scholars of both Hungarian and non-Hungarian birth at a number of American and Canadian colleges and universities who are interested in Hungarian history, literature and other aspects of culture. But perhaps less than half of them are located at institutions which have the potential for more comprehensive Hungarian studies programs. In addition to those already mentioned, the latter include T. Aczél, W.M. Johnston, L.

Tikos and F. Váli at the University of Massachusetts, M. Hollós at Brown University, T. Barker and J.F. Začec at the State University of New York at Albany, G. Bárány at the University of Denver, R. Braham, P. Fichtner, B. Király, M. Low and A.G. Whiteside at one or another of the colleges of the City University of New York. R.V. Burks at Wayne State University, L. Domonkos at Youngstown State University, J. Kessler at the University of Kentucky, M. Fenyo at Boston University, A. György and G. Teleki at George Washington University, G. Lányi at Oberlin College, A. Makkai at the University of Illinois-Chicago, A. Nekam at Northwestern University, M.S. Pap and G.J. Prpic at John Carroll University, J. Rath, the editor of the *Austrian History Yearbook*, at Rice University, J. Remak at the University of California-Santa Barbara, T. Sakmyster at the University of Cincinnati, B. Szabó at Long Beach State University, R. Tókécs at the University of Connecticut, I. Völgyes at the University of Nebraska, W.S. Vucinich at Stanford University, D.E. Weinberg at Case-Western Reserve University, Z.A.B. Zeman at the University of Texas, and P.E. Zinner at the University of California-Davis. Others are located at institutions which conceivably would be less willing and able to support comprehensive programs in Hungarian studies. These include W.M. Batkay and P. Pastor at Montclair State College, E. Chászár at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, J. Décsy and S. Goldberger at Greater Hartford Community College, C. Gáti at Union College and University, M. Hillinger at Hampton Institute, G. Horváth at Oregon State University, J. Horváth at Butler University, M.S. Horváth at St. Peter's College, A. Kovács and until recently B. Borisz at St. John's University, W.A. Jenks at Washington and Lee University, A. Kadarkay at Occidental College, S. Kosztolnyik at Texas A. and M. University, Z. Kramár at Central Washington State College, E. Lengyel at Fairleigh Dickinson University, A. Lengyel at Northern Kentucky State College, A. Ludányi at Ohio Northern University, N. Nagy-Talavera at Chico State College, A.N. Nyerges, Eastern Kentucky University, L.P. Pastor at Seton Hall University, J. Radványi at Mississippi State University, A.A. Reisch at Manhattan College, G. Rothenberg at Purdue University, M. Sózan at Slippery Rock State College, T.L. Szendrey at Gannon College, E.A. Tuleya at Millersville State College, A. Urbansky at the University of Bridgeport, A.H. Vardy at Robert Morris College, L. Vincze at Bowling Green State University, and perhaps numerous others whose names and activities have not come to my attention. Thus, this listing and categorization is neither complete, nor faultless. It simply reflects my awareness of scholars who are working or at least are interested in aspects of Hungarian studies; and the categorization is my understanding about their general social and institutional base.

While the fortunes of Hungarian studies have steadily declined during the 1970's, the situation is still far from hopeless. Both language and other fields are available for study at a high and comprehensive level. In the past, summer language courses have been offered both on the East and the West coast with the support of the NDEA. More recently the AAASS has made an effort to coordinate these efforts so as to permit alternating universities to participate in this undertaking. As an example, according to a recent survey by the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), in the summer of 1975 Hungarian language courses were available at least at five universities in the United States. In addition to the already discussed summer institute at Portland State University, these institutions included Kent State University, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Texas at Arlington, and Yale University. Several of these universities offered Hungarian courses on two or three levels, depending on demand. Moreover, specialized language instruction was also available abroad at the University of Debrecen in Hungary, and at the *Gesellschaft für Ost- und Südostkunde* in Linz, Austria.

In this connection mention should also be made of the significant work of the International Research and Exchanges Board of New York, which handles most of the official scholarly exchanges between the United States and Hungary. Established in 1958 as the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants at Indiana University, and transferred to New York City in 1969 under its new name, IREX is the most significant institution that makes it possible for American scholars to conduct research in Hungary under rather favorable circumstances.

Although initially American scholars could collectively spend only a total of twenty-four man months in Hungary, today seventy man-months are available. This makes it possible for IREX to send up to ten to twelve American scholars per year to Hungary, for periods ranging from one to twelve months per recipient. The scholars involved represent various fields, from humanities and social sciences, to natural and physical sciences. The beneficial effects of this exchange program are incalculable. This is attested to by all former IREX Fellows, including the author of the present study.

IREX also encourages various other forms of scholarly contacts and collaborations between American and Hungarian scholars and tries to aid such contacts with a limited number of *ad hoc* grants.

Some of the Major Problems of Hungarian Studies

Among the numerous problems that have plagued and still plague Hungarian studies in the United States and Canada, none is more significant than the lack of sufficient funds. Contrary to the situation in the interwar and the immediate post-World War II period, when there was a shortage of qualified scholars, today there are more than enough American and European-trained historians, political scientists, linguists and other scholars to man several significant Hungarian programs. In fact their major problem appears to be that they have nowhere to go with their training; or that they have to engage in activities and teach in fields which are really beyond their intended field of competence. Thus, the majority of them teach courses in Russian or general European history, literature, political science, etc., and only a lesser number of them stay within the confines of East Central and Southeastern Europe. Moreover, only a select and fortunate few can devote themselves primarily to Hungarian studies.

It is the absence of demand for their specialty that prevents Hungarian area scholars from becoming more immersed in Hungarian studies. This lack of demand is naturally reflected in the lack of sufficient funds. This is precisely why—after the brief flareup in the post-Sputnik period—Hungarian programs are again suffocating for want of financial support. Government grants have shrunk, and few of the universities seem to be able to support such “esoteric” and economically unviable programs as Hungarian studies. Private foundations geared toward the support of Hungarian studies can hardly keep going themselves.

Hungarian Foundations

The oldest and largest of these foundations is the *American Hungarian Foundation* (until 1974 known as the American Hungarian Studies Foundation), which was founded under the leadership of Professor A.J. Molnár, its current Executive Director. During its two decades of existence (1955-1975), the American Hungarian Studies Foundation distributed \$307,880 to various Hungarian studies programs, for fellowships, research grants, library collections and various other related Hungarian educational and cultural programs. While this undoubtedly appears to be a respectable sum (and it certainly involved major efforts on the part of the Foundation), it loses some of its impressiveness when viewed against the time span of twenty years, and against the overall size of the American Hungarian community (which numbers perhaps close to a million). It certainly does not speak well for the generosity of American Hungarians toward Hungarian culture and learning in the United States.

The foundation that distributed the next largest sum is the Canadian *Széchenyi Society*, founded in 1963 and directed by J. Fülöpp and L. Duska. Between 1964 and 1972 the Széchenyi Society's "Hungarian Educational Committee" collected and distributed close to \$50,000, supporting not only the Montreal Hungarian program, but also dozens of other cultural and scholarly activities. Since 1970, when the idea of a Hungarian chair at the University of Toronto was conceived, the Széchenyi Society raised over \$190,000 for that purpose. This is still far short of the goal of \$575,000, but it speaks well for the Canadian Hungarians. Despite their being fewer in number, they appear to be more generous toward Hungarian culture and learning than their counterparts in the United States.

The third foundation in the area of Hungarian studies is the *Hungarian Cultural Foundation*, established and led by Professor Joseph Értavy-Baráth. This foundation came into being in 1966 largely for the purpose of supporting a Hungarian program at one of the colleges or universities in Buffalo. When the Buffalo Hungarian program was finally established in 1969, it depended largely on the support of the Hungarian Cultural Foundation. In the same year the foundation also began a valuable publication series in conjunction with the Program in East European and Slavic Studies at the State University of New York College at Buffalo. When completed as projected, the series will have between 25 and 30 significant volumes on Hungarian literature, history and on various other aspects of Hungarian culture. So far six volumes have appeared (on E. Ady, L. Mécs, S. Petőfi, A. József, L. Kossuth and N. Lenau), and several others are in the final stages of publication.

The Hungarians of North America have also initiated some years ago the *United Hungarian Fund* for the purposes of supporting Hungarian studies on the primary, secondary and university level. Though the Fund had been re-started several times, usually under different leadership, it still has far to go to become a viable organization. Moreover, up to now very little of its financial support went to existing Hungarian programs on the university level. The United Hungarian Fund appears to be more interested in primary and secondary education and in youth organizations.

Problems of Publication

Closely related to financial problems is the difficulty of publishing in the area of Hungarian studies in North America. The number of journals and other periodicals is limited, and the publication of monographs is next to impossible. The difficulty is best illustrated by the fact that no major journal of Hungarian studies came into existence even during the heyday of these studies in the 1960's. The ephemeral

The Hungarian Quarterly (1961-1965) was closer to a political and cultural than to a scholarly journal, and it never managed to acquire the desired stature. The multilingual *Hungarian Historical Review* (1969-), which subsequently moved to South America, lacks the necessary institutional affiliation and it publishes almost exclusively in proto-history. Not until 1974 was there a new attempt made, when *The Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies* appeared on the scene, under the editorship of Professor N.F. Dreisziger. It is sponsored by the Hungarian Readers' Service of Canada, whose director, Dr. F. Harcsár, hopes to affiliate the journal with a scholarly institution. It is hoped that the Review will emerge into a position of a respected and quoted journal in its field.

A year earlier, the American Hungarian Foundation launched its *Hungarian Studies Newsletter* (1973-) under the Editorship of Professor B.C. Maday. But being what it is, a newsletter and not a periodical, it publishes only brief book and periodical reviews and short notices on research in progress and on exchange programs. It does not carry articles of a scholarly nature.

There are of course a number of well-established area periodicals, such as the *Slavic Review* (1941-), the *Slavic and East European Journal* (1943-), *The Austrian History Yearbook* (1965-), the *East European Quarterly* (1967-), the *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* (1967-), the lesser known and irregular *Studies for a New Central Europe* (1963-), and the more recent *East Central Europe* (1974-) and *Southeastern Europe* (1974-). They usually publish on the whole area or on large regions of East Central and Eastern Europe, and do so in numerous fields. Consequently, their capacity to publish on Hungarian topics is limited.

The difficulties in the area of periodical publications are multiplied when it comes to the publication of monographs. The most significant monograph series in the area include Indiana University's "Uralic and Altaic Series", which since 1960 has published well over 150 volumes; Columbia University's "East Central European Studies" series, with close to two dozen volumes; and the more recent "East European Monographs" series, published by the *East European Quarterly* at the University of Colorado and distributed by Columbia University Press, which in the course of the past five years has published about a dozen volumes. The existence of these series is very significant, for they all include Hungarian topics. Because of the lack of formerly available funds, however, they all seem to have slowed down the pace of publication.

There are some primarily Hungarian undertakings in the area of monographic publications. The most significant of these are two series: One referred to earlier and sponsored by the Hungarian Cul-

tural Foundation within the "East European and Slavic Studies" series of the SUNY College of Buffalo; and the second being the "Hungarian Heritage Books" series under the sponsorship of the Hungarian Literary Guild and the Danubian Press. Both of these series are suffering from the lack of adequate funds, and the latter also from the lack of accepted scholarly institutional affiliation.

In the light of the above, it is hardly surprising that most specialists of Hungarian studies find it difficult to publish in their field, and that with a few fortunate exceptions even the many dozens of valuable Ph.D. dissertations remain unpublished. The demand for scholarly publications in Hungarian studies is so limited that most commercial publishers do not even consider them. (A recent notable exception is the "Hungarian Authors" series, initiated by Twayne Publishers in 1975, under the editorship of Dr. Enikő M. Basa. The volumes in this series, however, have to be written according to a specific and uniform formula.) University presses, which previously at least considered some manuscripts in the area, have also become reluctant to publish on such esoteric topics as Hungarian studies.

Associations of Hungarian Area Specialists

Up to relatively recently, Hungarian studies were not represented by any independent scholarly association. Hungarian area specialists functioned only within such more comprehensive organizations as the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, the Conference Group on Central Europe, and various regional organizations. In 1969, on the initiative of Professor Peter F. Sugar and others, efforts were begun to establish an association for historians with Hungarian interests. The result was the foundation in 1970 of the American Association for the Study of Hungarian History (AASHH), which subsequently sought affiliation with several more encompassing professional societies. The purpose of the AASHH is to establish contacts among historians with interest in Hungary, both in North America, as well as in Europe. It does so, partially by organizing Hungarian panels at various scholarly meetings, and partially by publishing a *Newsletter*, which includes news of the profession and lists many of the current publications of its members.

Another somewhat more encompassing association was founded in 1974. Called the American Hungarian Educators' Association, this organization hopes to unite those college and university professors (and secondary school teachers) who have scholarly or cultural interests in Hungary. Under the temporary leadership of Dr. Enikő M. Basa, the AHEA hopes to affiliate with several American professional associations and to hold annual conferences. It already has close ties with the American Hungarian Foundation's *Hungarian Studies Newsletter*, which carries most of the news about the new association.

The Three "Worlds" of a Scholar of Hungarian Studies

In addition to the well-known financial problems (i.e. the lack of funds either for teaching programs, or for publications), the most significant problem that plagues scholars of Hungarian studies in North America is their somewhat ambiguous position in the three separate "worlds" to which they are more or less attached. While trying to conform to the rigorous demands of the American scholarly world, they are confronted on the one hand with the expectations of the American-Hungarian community, and on the other with those of the present-day Hungarian scholarship in Hungary. The interests of the latter two usually clash, as do the interests of objective scholarship and those of the politically charged American-Hungarian community. Thus, whatever the practitioner of Hungarian studies does (particularly if he is of Hungarian birth or background), he is certainly unable to live up to the expectations of all of these three separate worlds. In American scholarly circles he is generally thought to be less than fully objective, even if he goes out of his way to be so; the politically charged American-Hungarian community usually regards his striving for objectivity as an act bordering on treachery to Magyar-dom; and in the scholarly world of today's Hungary he is often suspected of being the harbinger of various "bourgeois" and other anti-Marxist ideas, and thus the value of his work is questioned. Consequently, while trying to preserve his independence and scholarly integrity, many a scholar of Hungarian studies in North America finds himself suspected and distrusted by all of the three "worlds" in which he moves. And thus, unless willing to sell himself to the highest bidder, he usually ends up as an isolated advocate of an esoteric cause.

SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

The purpose of this essay is to summarize and to evaluate briefly the development of Hungarian studies in the United States and Canada on the college and university level. While I have tried to mention most of the significant milestones in this development, this essay makes no claim to comprehensiveness, nor to finality in its evaluations. It is not based on a statistical analysis of all possible sources, partially because of many of the desired sources are still not available, and partially because such a thorough analysis could only be published in a monograph form.

Most of the current information in this essay is derived from direct communication—both written and oral—with colleagues who are active in the field of Hungarian Studies in the United States and Canada. Some of these came in the form of observations and criticism on one of my earlier studies on this topic entitled *Magyarságtudo-*

mány az észak-amerikai egyetemeken és főiskolákon/Hungarian Studies at North American Colleges and Universities/ (1973); others are the result of conscious data collection on my part. Information was also derived from the most recent catalogues of the universities discussed, as well as from brochures published by institutes and departments within these universities.

Because Hungarian studies are in a constant state of flux, and because not many colleagues took the effort to report on their respective programs in response to my appeals published in the *Hungarian Studies Newsletter* and the *Newsletter* of the American Association for the Study of Hungarian History, some of the most recent (and perhaps some earlier) developments may have escaped my attention. I do hope that response to this study will be more widespread and I shall be able to prepare a more thorough and comprehensive summary on this topic in the future.

The text of the original version of this essay was read and criticized by the following scholars: Paul Bódy (Ohio State University), James F. Clarke (University of Pittsburgh), Nándor F. Dreisziger (Royal Military College of Canada), Joseph Értavy-Baráth (Hungarian Cultural Foundation), Béla C. Maday (American University), August J. Molnár (American Hungarian Foundation), Denis Sinor (Indiana University), and Ágnes Huszár Várdy (Robert Morris College).

While I am grateful to them, and have tried to take their recommendations into consideration, it was not always possible. Thus, the final version of this essay reflects my own knowledge and thinking about the topic, as well as my limitations and fallibilities.

Since much of the information in this essay is based on other than published sources, only direct quotations from printed sources are documented. Some of the results of my research have already appeared in print in the form of the studies listed under my name. I have relied on them considerably, but I have also found the following additional works useful.

NOTES

1. *A Kir. Magy. Egyetemi Nyomda jelentése a "Magyar történet" befejezéséről és a magyarság tudományos megismerését szolgáló "Hungarológiai Sorozat" további köteteiről* [The Report of the Roy. Hung. University Press on the Completion of the "Hungarian History" and on the Forthcoming Volumes of the "Hungarological Series" Destined for the Scientific Examination of the Magyars], attached to vol. VIII of Bálint Hóman's and Gyula Szekfű's *Hungarian History*, 8 vols. (Budapest 1928-1934), p. 1.
2. Kodály Musical Training Institute flyer, August 1, 1973 (Wellesley, Mass.), p. 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A magyar nyelvért és kultúráért. Tájékoztató az 1970. augusztus 1-15-e között Debrecenben és Budapesten megrendezett anyanyelvi konferencia anyagából* [For Hungarian Language and Culture. Selections from the Material of the Mother Language Conference Organized at Debrecen and Budapest between August 1 and 15, 1970], ed. Samu Imre (Budapest 1971).
- A . . . *Magyar Találkozó Kronikája—Proceedings of the . . . th Annual Congress of the Hungarian Scientific, Literary and Artistic Association*, vol. I., ed. Béla Bélydy; vols. II-XIV, ed. János Nádas and Ferenc Somogyi (Cleveland 1975).
- American Association for the Study of Hungarian History, *Newsletter* (1973-1975).
American Hungarian Studies Foundation Bulletin (1971-1975).
- American Hungarian Studies Foundation, *Executive Director's Report for 1973-1974 to the Annual Meeting of the American Hungarian Studies Foundation at the Plaza Hotel, New York City, Thursday, September 26, 1974*.
- Austerlitz, Robert, "John Lotz, 1913-1973", *Slavic Review*, vol. 33, no. 2 (June 1974), pp. 419-421.
- Austrian History Yearbook*, vols. I-X (Houston, Texas 1965-1974).
- Axelrod, J. and Bigelow, D.N., *Resources for Language and Area Studies* (New York 1962).
- Bakó, Elemér, *American Hungarian Dialect Notes I. Goals and Methods of Hungarian Dialectology in America—Az amerikai magyar népryelvkutatás céljai és módszere* (New Brunswick, N.J. 1962).
- _____, *Guide to Hungarian Studies*, 2 vols. (Stanford, Calif. 1973).
- _____, "Hungarian Dialectology in the USA", *The Hungarian Quarterly*, vol. I, no. 4 (Oct. 1961), pp. 48-53.
- _____, "The Goals and Methods of Hungarian Dialectology in the United States", *Communications et Rapports du Premier Congrès International de Dialectologie generale* (Louvain du 21 au 25 aout, Bruxelles les 26 et 27 aout 1960) (Louvain 1965), pp. 23-29.
- Bodnár, Gábor, *A külföldi magyar oktatás 1974-ben* [The Teaching of Hungarian Abroad in 1974] (n.p., n.d.).
- Clarke, James F., "Some Problems in East European Studies", in *Area Study Programs: The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe*, ed. Royden Dangerfield (Urbana, Ill. 1955).
- Columbia University, Institute on East Central Europe, *Newsletter*, no. 1 (1969).
- Cyr, Leo G., *In-Service Training of Foreign Affairs Officers* [Ohio University Papers in International Studies] (Athens, Ohio 1966).
- Czigány, Lóránt, "A Survey of Finno-Ugric Studies in Great Britain", *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, vol. 39, nos. 1-2 (1967), pp. 107-111.
- Deák, István, "American (and some British) Historians Look at Austria-Hungary", *The New Hungarian Quarterly*, Vol. 12 (Spring 1971), pp. 162-174.
- Diakovics, János, "A Bloomfield College and Seminary magyar munkája, 1903-1937" [The Hungarian Studies at Bloomfield College and Seminary, 1903-1937], *Bethlen Naptár* (Ligonier, Pa. 1938), pp. 147-150.
- Directory of American Scholars: A Biographical Directory*. Vol. I: History, 5th ed. (New York, 1969), 6th ed. (New York 1974).
- Fellner, Fritz and Gottas, Friedrich, "Habsburg Studies in Europe", *Austrian History Yearbook*, vol. III, pt. 3 (1967), pp. 296-307.
- Fishman, Joshua A., *Hungarian Language Maintenance in the United States* [Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series No. 62] (Bloomington, Ind. and The Hague, 1966).
- Glatz, Ferenc, "Klebensberg Tudománypolitikai programja és a magyar történettudomány" [Klebensberg's Scientific Policies and Hungarian Historical Sciences], *Századok*, vol. 103 (1969), pp. 1176-1200.
- Horecky, Paul L. (ed.) *East Central Europe: A guide to Basic Publications* (Chicago 1969).
- Hungarian Studies Newsletter*, nos. 1-7 (1973-1975).

- Hungarians in America*, 2nd ed. by Tibor Szy (New York, 1966), 3rd ed. by Desi K. Bognár (Mount Vernon, N.Y. 1972).
- Indiana University, Department of Uralic and Altaic Studies brochures (Spring 1971 and Oct. 1972).
- Indiana University, Research Center for the Language Sciences, *Publications* (Bloomington, Ind. 1972).
- International Research and Exchanges Board, *Survey of East European and Russian Language Institutes and Courses Offered by American Universities in the U.S. and Europe, Summer 1975* (New York 1975).
- Iltt-Ott, vols. I-VIII (1968-1975). An irregularly appearing periodical of a circle of young Hungarian intellectuals in the United States and Canada.
- Jelavich, Charles (ed.), *Language and Area Studies. East Central and Southeastern Europe: A Survey* (Chicago and London 1969).
- Kerecsendi-Kiss, Márton, "Kirkconnell professzor" [Professor Kirkconnell], *Emlékkönyv* [Memorial Album] (Cleveland, Ohio 1972), pp. 155-158.
- Kerecsendi-Kiss, Márton, "Reményi József" [Joseph Reményi], in *Emlékkönyv*, pp. 143-145.
- Kirkconnell, Watson, "A Canadian Meets the Magyars", *The Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies*, vol. I, nos. 1-2 (Spring-Fall 1974), pp. 1-11.
- Kirkconnell, Watson, *A Slice of Canada: Memoires* (Toronto 1967).
- Könnyű, Leslie, *Hungarians in the U.S.A.: An Immigration Study* (St. Louis 1967).
- Könnyű, Leslie, *A History of American Hungarian Literature* (St. Louis 1962).
- Kósa, John, "A Century of Hungarian Emigration, 1850-1950", *American Slavic and East European Review*, vol. 16 (Dec. 1957), pp. 501-514.
- Kovács, Martin Louis, *Esterházy and Early Hungarian Immigration to Canada* [Canadian Plains Studies—2, University of Regina] (Regina, Saskatchewan 1974).
- "Külföldi magyar intézetek" [Hungarian Institutions Abroad], in *Magyarország tisztí cim- és névtára* [Address and Name Index of Hungary's Public Servants], vol. 48 (Budapest 1941), pp. 377-378.
- Lázár, Ferenc, "Néhány gondolat a magyar nyelv helyzetéről az Amerikai Egyesült Államokban" [Random Thoughts on the Position of the Hungarian Language in the United States of America], *A magyar nyelvért és kultúráért. Tájékoztató* no. 8 (Budapest 1972), pp. 4-12.
- [Lotz, John], "The Career and Publications of John Lotz", *The Linguistic Report: A Newsletter in Applied Linguistics*, vol. 18, no. 7 (Sept. 1974), pp. 15-19.
- Lotz, János, "Magyar nyelvészeti kutatások az Amerikai Egyesült Államokban" [Hungarian Linguistic Studies in the United States of America], *A magyar nyelv története és rendszere. A debreceni nemzetközi nyelvészkongresszus előadásai (1966 augusztus 24-28)* [The History and System of the Magyar Language. The Papers of the International Linguistic Conference of Debrecen (August 24-28, 1966)], ed. Samu Imre and István Szathmári (Budapest 1967), pp. 32-37.
- Lotz, John [János], *The Uralic and Altaic Program of the American Council of Learned Societies (1959-1965)* [Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series No. 63] (Bloomington, Ind. and The Hague 1966).
- Magyar Tájékoztató Zsebkönyv* [Hungarian Information Handbook], 2nd ed. (Budapest 1943).
- Magyary, Zoltán (ed.), *A magyar tudománypolitika alapvetése* [The Foundations of Hungarian Scientific Policy] (Budapest 1927).
- Makkai, Ádám, "Az amerikai egyetemi rendszer és párhuzama az európai rendszerekkel" [The American University System and its Parallels with the European System], *Ótágu Síp* (New Brunswick, N.J.), vol. I, no. 2 (June 1973), pp. 153-168 and vol. I, no. 3 (October 1973), pp. 228-241.
- Moses, Larry, *Language and Area Study Programs in American Universities* [Department of State] (Washington, D.C. 1964).
- Muffett, D.J.M., "Leo Wiener—A Plea for Re-examination and Scholarly Re-assessment". (Unpublished paper, Institute of African Affairs, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1972).

- Nagy, Iván, *Az amerikai magyarság* [The American Hungarians] (Pecs 1939).
- _____, *Les Hongrois dans le Monde—Hungarians in Canada* (Pécs (1938).
- _____, *Öt világész magyarsága* (Hungarians of Five Continents) (Budapest 1935).
- Nagy, Károly, *Külföldi magyar iskolánk gondjairól* (On the Problems of Our Hungarian Schools Abroad) (n.p., n.d.).
- _____, " 'Szubkulturák' vagy 'integráció' " ('Subcultures' or 'Integration'), *Új Látóhatár* (München), vol. 21 (July 1970), pp. 239-247.
- Nagy, Kázmér, *Elveszett alkotmány. Vázlat az 1944 és 1964 közötti magyar politikai emigráció kialakulásáról* (The Lost Constitution. An Outline of the Development of Hungarian Political Emigration between 1944 and 1964) (München 1974).
- Nyelvünk és Kultúránk. A II Anyanyelvi Konferencia Tanácskozásainak összefoglalása* (Szombathely, 1973 július 29 - augusztus 5) (Our Language and Culture. Proceedings of the Second Mother Language Conference (Szombathely, July 29 - August 5, 1973)), ed. Samu Imre (Budapest 1973).
- Oslányi, Robert, "Beszámoló a magyar egyetemi hallgatók működéséről a Clevelandi Állami Egyetemen" [Report on the Activities of the Hungarian Students at Cleveland State University], *Itt-Ott*, vol. IV, nos. 3-4 (Dec. 1970 - Jan. 1971), pp. 4-12.
- _____, "Beszámoló a clevelandi magyar egyetemi hallgatók működéséről és a könyvgyűjtés jelenlegi állásáról" [Report on the Activities of the Hungarian University Students of Cleveland and of the Status of Book Collection Drive], *Itt-Ott*, vol. IV, nos. 5-6 (March-April 1971), pp. 38-39.
- _____, "A Clevelandi Állami Egyetem magyar tagozata jelenti" [Report by the Hungarian Program of Cleveland State University], *Itt-Ott*, vol. IV, no. 11 (Sept. 1971), pp. 22-24.
- _____, "Az utolsó nyilatkozat" /The Final Statement/, *Az Újság* (Cleveland, June 19, 1975), p. 7.
- Puskás, Julia, "Magyar szervezetek Amerikában (Az 1880-as évektől napjainkig)" [Hungarian Organizations in America (From the 1880's till Our Own Days)], *Történelmi Szemle*, vol. 13 (1970), pp. 528-568.
- Radványi, Tamás, "Magyartanítás Bloomingtonban" [The Teaching of Hungarian at Bloomington (Indiana University)], *Nyelvünk és Kultúránk*, no. 20 (1975), pp. 54-55.
- Rutgers—The State University, *The Annual Report, 1958-1959* (New Brunswick, N.J. 1959)
- Schroeder, Paul W., "The Status of Habsburg Studies in the United States", *Austrian History Yearbook*, vol. VIII, pt. 3 (1967), pp. 267-295.
- Sebeok, Thomas A., "John Lotz: A Personal Memoire," *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, vol. 46 (1974), pp. 1-26.
- Sinor, Dénes, "Magyarságtudomány az amerikai egyetemeken" [Hungarian Studies at American Universities], *Magyar Nemzet* (Budapest, August 12, 1973).
- _____, "Teaching 'Hungary' ", *The New Hungarian Quarterly*, vol. 12, no. 42 (Summer 1971), pp. 37-46.
- _____, "Uralic and Altaic Studies", *The Review* [Indiana University], vol. IX. (Fall 1967), pp. 1-8.
- Sugar, Peter, "Közép- és Kelet-Európa történetének kutatása az Északamerikai Egyesült Államokban" [Research in the History of Central and Eastern Europe in the United States of America], *Történelmi Szemle*, vol. IX (1966), pp. 119-124.
- Szalatnai, Rezső, "Ne felejtjük el Reményi Józsefet" [Let us not Forget Joseph Reményi], *Magyar Hírek*, vol. 26, no. 24 (Nov. 24 1973).
- Szántó, Miklós, *Magyarok a Nagyvilágban* (Budapest 1970).

- Széchenyi Társaság, *A Széchenyi Társaság részletes beszámolója a kormány által támogatott torontói konferenciáról és közgyűlésről a magyar tervek összehangolására (1972 Május 12-15)* [A Detailed Report by the Széchenyi Society on the Government-Supported Conference and Plenary Session on the Synchronization of Hungarian Plans (May 12-15, 1972)] (Toronto 1972).
- Szépe, György, "Lotz János emlékezete" [Remembering John Lotz], *A magyar nyelvért, kultúráért. Tájékoztató*, no. 13 (Budapest 1973), pp. 52-53.
- Turner, Cornelius P. (ed.), *A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services* [American Council on Education] (Washington, D. C. 1968).
- Várdyné, Ágnes Huszár, "Alsó- és középfokú magyarságtudományi oktatás Észak-Amerikában" [Hungarian Studies in North America on the Primary and Secondary Level], *A XIII. Magyar Találkozó Krónikája* (Cleveland, Ohio 1974), pp. 39-56.
- Várdy, Ágnes Huszár, "A magyar nyelvoktatás nehézségei Észak-Amerikában" [The Difficulties of Hungarian Language Instruction in North America], *Ótágu Sip*, vol. I, nos. 5-6 (Spring 1974), pp. 442-450. Reprinted in *Nyelvünk és Kultúránk* (Budapest), 17 (1974), pp. 13-18, and in *Látóhatár* (Budapest, August 1975), pp. 174-184.
- Várdy, [Steven] Béla, "A magyar nyelv és kultúra tanítása az amerikai egyetemeken" [The Teaching of Hungarian Language and Culture at American Universities] (Unpublished paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Hungarian Philosophical and Scientific Society, New Brunswick, N. J. Sept. 29, 1973).
- _____, *Magyarságtudomány az észak-amerikai egyetemeken és főiskolákon* [Hungarian Studies at North American Colleges and Universities] (Cleveland 1973). Originally published in *A XII. Magyar Találkozó Krónikája* (Cleveland, 1973) pp. 102-132.
- _____, "Magyarságtudomány és a magyar emigráció" [Hungarian Studies and Hungarian Emigration], *Magyarság* (Pittsburgh, Pa.) (Oct. 5, 1973).
- _____, "A magyarságtudomány helyzete és problémái az amerikai egyetemeken" [The Position and Problems of Hungarian Studies at American universities], *Nyelvünk és Kultúránk* (Budapest), 20 (1975), pp. 27-32.
- Wandycz, Piotr S. (ed.), *Preliminary Survey of Russian and East European Graduate Courses at American and Canadian Universities* (New Haven, Conn. 1970).

REVIEW ARTICLE

Origins of Romanesque Rotundas in East-Central Europe

Veronika Gervers-Molnar

Moravia's History Reconsidered: A Reinterpretation of Medieval Sources. By Imre Boba. The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1971. Pp. 167. Price: Guilders 24.30. ISBN 90 247 5041 5.

During the pre-Romanesque and Romanesque periods, a large and characteristic group of round churches appeared in East-Central Europe, particularly in the territory of medieval Poland, Bohemia and Hungary, though similar structures may also be found in parts of Germany, Austria and Yugoslavia. The earliest examples, dating from the 10th and early 11th centuries, were built as chapels of dukes and royal palaces. The form continued to be favoured after this time, but the function changed. From about the mid-11th century, many of them were built as seigneurial chapels for castles and fortresses. Yet the majority were constructed as simple village parish churches and flourished in that capacity from the 11th to the 13th century.

Almost all of the early chapels are known from excavations, and most of them have been discovered since World War II. Because of the recent nature of the discoveries, there is as yet no comprehensive work published on the subject. A number of studies have been written concerning the results of excavations done within the boundaries of one or the other of the countries in the area under consideration. Some deal with the problems of a single structure, while others take a wider view and discuss a particular group, or the rotundas of an entire country. There now seems to be enough ground to go beyond such local studies and to draw some general conclusions concerning these structures in the whole of East-Central Europe.

These round churches probably derive from Carolingian and Ottonian models. The early rotundas seem to imitate, both in their basic form and function, a venerated prototype, Charlemagne's imperial palace chapel at Aachen. Almost as soon as it had been built,

this church became a symbol of the whole Carolingian Empire, and of the strength of Charlemagne. Furthermore, bolstered by the reminiscences it bore, it symbolized the first Christian emperor, Constantine the Great, his palace in Constantinople, and the central churches built in Jerusalem. The oft visited, and highly admired church of Aachen was one of the most frequently copied buildings of the Christian world. Contemporary imitations appeared, and the Ottos were responsible for a whole series of copies all over the Empire.

The influence of Aachen reached the newly Christianized countries of East-Central Europe, which took, as their most important model, the Empire of the Ottos, and through it that of Charlemagne. By building their palace chapels on a central plan, imitating Aachen, the first rulers of these lands endeavoured to absorb and share the legitimacy of that proven Empire, and to show themselves similar, if not equal, to their western neighbours. For obvious economic and technical reasons, the palace chapels of these territories were built on a considerably smaller scale and with a much simpler architectural construction than that of their idealized prototype.

The most impressive monument from Bohemian territory is the *Saint Vit of Prague*, which was discovered during the excavations of 1911 and 1931 in the castle of Hradčín.¹ From the relatively meagre wall-remains, Professor Cibulka's reconstruction proposes four large, horse-shoe shaped apses at the cardinal points of the round nave. Since the inner diameter of the central part is 13 m, quite large compared to the other monuments of the area, Cibulka reasonably suggested that there must have been a series of pillars or columns around the centre of the interior supporting a cupola. The Prague church was built by Prince Venceslas as his palace chapel in the first half of the 10th century, but certainly before 940. The other early Czech monuments, much smaller in size and simpler in plan, such as the *Saint Clement at Levý Hradec*, the *Saint Peter at Budeč*, the *Saint John the Baptist at Vyšehrad*, the *Saint Peter at Stará Plzeň*, the *Saint Désiré at Lysa*, and the *Holy Mary at Znojmo*, were all situated in ducal or royal castles, and served as private chapels of the Přemislid family.² Most of them have a circular nave with a semi-circular apse, and in almost every case date from the 10th or early 11th centuries.

In Poland also, the earliest monuments are closely connected with the palaces of the ruling dynasty, the Piasts.³ Archaeological research has brought to light five early administrative centres, from which in four cases round or centrally planned chapels were found. The chapel of *Ostrów Lednicki*, built originally with an emphasized central tower supported by four strong pillars, was connected to the palace. The staircase tower suggests a special choir for the ruler, which could have been approached directly from his living quarters. In Giecz, the same

basic system can be seen in the form of a simpler, completely round chapel. At Przemyśl, attached again to a palace, the chapel has a round nave and a semi-circular apse towards the east. In the *Wawel of Krakow*, the church has a more complicated ground plan with four large apses at the cardinal points, thus strongly resembling the *Saint Vit of Prague*, although on a reduced scale. The remains of a staircase tower leading to a choir were also discovered here. The Polish monuments date from the second half of the 10th and early 11th centuries, and were built either by Mieszko I (mid-10th c. - 992) or by his son, Boleslav the Brave (992-1075). Their local prototype must have been built in either Poznań or Gniezno, if not at both of these sites, where the palaces have unfortunately not yet been excavated.

The earliest Hungarian rotundas, dating from the late 10th to the mid-11th century, follow the same line as the Bohemian or Polish monuments.⁴ The earliest example is the palace chapel of Duke Géza (970-990) at Esztergom, one of the first capitals of Hungary. Significantly enough, it is dedicated to Saint Vit and, with its more complex ground plan, is reminiscent of the *Saint Vit of Prague*. A second rotunda came to light directly beside the north wall of the cathedral at Veszprém, in an early ducal castle, which was later owned by the queen. Its orientation is quite different from that of the cathedral, which must have been under construction, if not completed, in 1002. The rotunda was most likely built earlier. A third important monument was excavated at Sáropatak on the south side of the Gothic parish church. Here again, the orientation of the rotunda is very different from that of the later building. Sáropatak served as one of the early royal residences in Hungary. The round church was probably built by King Andrew I (1042-1060). In the 13th century, a castle, replacing the old royal residence, was built in a different part of the town. As a result, the chapel lost its original function and became the local parish church. Soon afterwards, a larger church was built directly beside it, and retained the old privileges attached to the rotunda. We learn even from documents of the late 14th century that the parish church was exempt from episcopal control, and was directly under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Esztergom, a privilege characteristic only of royal chapels.

Amongst the early rotundas of these countries, there is but a single group, those discovered in the territory of the so-called Great Moravian Empire in the valley of the northern Morava River in present day Czechoslovakia, which do not seem to fit the general development. Although the churches of Mikulčice and Staré Město can be associated with centres of importance, none of them can be considered as palace chapel. At the same time, since Moravia was overrun and completely destroyed by the invading Hungarians

between 900 and 907, their excavators and all Czech architectural historians date them to the 9th century, predating the rotundas previously mentioned.⁵

In Mikulčice, three rotundas were found in the vicinity of the fortification. The most interesting one (no. 6), found north-east of the castle, has a horse-shoe shaped apse both on the eastern and western sides of the round nave, a form which may be a derivation of more complicated structures. The walled cemetery around it, containing a number of rich graves, suggests that the church had a considerable importance. The second rotunda (no. 7) is a simpler monument with a poorer cemetery around it, and was found somewhat further away from the castle walls. The third church, completely circular from the outside, has four, semi-circular niches built into the thickness of its interior walls. It is considered to have been a baptistery. Neither in function, nor form does it appear to belong to the group under discussion. The fourth rotunda, probably with a horse-shoe shaped apse at the east side of the round nave, is from Staré Město.

According to Czech scholars, Mikulčice must have been the centre of Great Moravia, the princely site of Rastislav and Svatopluk, and perhaps already of Mojmir I, while Staré Město could have belonged to a member of the ruling family or to one of the important families of the Moravian court. Not only has it been presumed that these round churches were built in the 9th century, but new research has often connected them with the mission of Saints Cyril and Methodius, and has sought their architectural prototypes in the region of the Adriatic, a Slavic cultural sphere. It has also been argued that these rotundas, being the earliest of their type in East-Central Europe, had to be the prototypes of the Bohemian and other examples, and even the more complicated structures, such as the *Saint Vit of Prague*, must have derived from them.

Through a critical analysis of historical sources, Professor Boba in his recent work, *Moravia's History Reconsidered*, reached the conclusion that Moravia of the 9th century did not exist north of the Danube as has been generally believed. Indeed, a principality called Moravia did not exist at all. It clearly shows from the examination of western, Byzantine and Church Slavonic written documents that what has been considered the country of Moravia was in reality a Slavonic principate around the town of Marava (Maraha, Margus), the Sirmium of antiquity (today Sremská Mitrovica, Yugoslavia). This town, and the territory under its jurisdiction, was inhabited by Slavonians (in Latin *Sclavi*, *Slavi*; in Church Slavonic *Slaviene*). It was not an independent political formation, but a patrimonium of Slavonia, which extended from the Dalmatian coast to Belgrade and Niš.

The geographical localization of this "Moravia" is a key factor when considering the extent of the mission of Cyril and Methodius amongst the Slavs. In the light of Boba's research, the bishopric/archbishopric of Methodius could not have been situated north of the Danube. It is apparent from the sources that Rastislav of Marava, together with the other Slavonian princes asked the Byzantine emperor, Michael III, for a teacher. Kocel thereupon requested the pope to appoint Methodius to the episcopal see of Saint Andronicus (Saint Andronicus is known to have been bishop of Sirmium in Roman times) on the territory of Rastislav. Pope Harian II made him the archbishop of "all the Sloven lands", and not of "all Slavs" or "all Slavic nations", as it has been mistakenly translated. As we learn from a letter of Pope John VIII (872-882), Methodius' see was Marava, that is to say Sirmium: "Methodius reverentissimus archiepiscopus sanctae ecclesiae Marahensis", which became "Methodius, archbishop of Moravia" only through erroneous translation. Beside the language difficulties, the former interpreters of the question neglected the fact that in the 9th century, and already earlier, a see had to have a cathedral: it was *impossible* to appoint a bishop or archbishop simply to a territory or a country. Looking at the problem purely from the legal view-point, Methodius could not have been made a "missionary bishop", or a "bishop-archbishop without a see", or "nominally the bishop of Sirmium" working in the court of Svatopluk north of the Danube with a see either at Nitra or Velehrad. Furthermore, the diocese of Methodius is called *diocesis Pannonica*, which—while it included Sirmium—could not have even partially been north of the Danube.

In this light, the rotundas found at Mikulčice and Staré Město could not have been "Moravian", and are not necessarily to be dated as early as the 9th century. This early dating was not deduced from the archaeological finds of the cemeteries around the churches, but was concluded mainly from the historical fact that the Hungarians demolished Moravia in the early years of the 10th century, in which case the churches must have been built, they conclude, prior to the invasions.

Under the circumstances, there can be little doubt that the *Saint Vit of Prague*, built sometime before 940, must have been the earliest round church of these territories. It was this building, a derivation of the palace chapel at Aachen, which served as a prototype for the other Czech rotundas, a view which was suggested by Cibulka himself as early as 1934. However, this view has been completely rejected in recent works emanating from Czechoslovakia. The round churches discovered at the so-called "Moravian" sites may consequently be dated some time between 940 and the early 11th century.

In Hungary, the first round church, built in Esztergom at the end

of the 10th century, was dedicated to Saint Vit, as was the Prague church. Notwithstanding the possibility that there might have been here direct influences from Aachen, which would be quite understandable from the dynastic and political connections of the Árpáds, the similar dedication may show links with the neighbouring court of Prague. Since Saint Adalbert, the bishop of Prague, visited and aided Duke Géza in 995, he might have instigated the building of the Esztergom rotunda. The other Hungarian examples probably have derived directly from it.

The *Saint Vit of Prague* and the other early Czech rotundas might also have had some influence on the round palace chapels of Poland. Duke Mieszko, who was baptised in 966, married a Bohemian princess, Dubravka. At the same time, however, a closer influence of Aachen is apparent in Poland, which may be explained by the political relations with the Ottos of Mieszko I, and particularly of Boleslav the Brave. Of the new monarchies, it is in Poland alone that the rotundas are not only built in a castle, but are actually constructed together with the royal palaces, clearly a simplified variation of Charlemagne's ensemble. That all these structures were dedicated to the Virgin Mary, an otherwise uncommon dedication in these lands at this time, again shows a strong Carolingian tradition.

Arguing from the conclusions reached by Professor Boba, it can be stated that the earliest rotundas of East-Central Europe do not derive from those round churches discovered at the so-called Great Moravian sites. Through Ottonian influence their major source of inspiration was Charlemagne's palace chapel at Aachen. Naturally, when the type was established with the building of the *Saint Vit of Prague*, this local example influenced many of those built later both within Bohemia and in the neighbouring lands, while direct connections with Aachen can also be seen.⁶

NOTES

1. Cibulka, J., *Václavova rotunda svatého víta*, in the series *Svatováclavský Sborník*, I, Praha, 1934; Merhautová, A., "Les débuts de l'architecture du haut moyen âge en Bohême", *Mélanges offert à René Crozet*, I, Poitiers, 1966, p. 116; Merhautová-Livorová, A., *Einfache mitteleuropäische Rundkirchen: Ihr Ursprung, Zweck, und ihre Bedeutung*, Prag, 1970.
2. Kořán, I., "Tradition des églises à plan central de Bohême", *Mélanges offert à René Crozet*, II, Poitiers, 1966, pp. 1058-59; Merhautová (1966), pp. 111-117.
3. Zurowska, K., "L'origine du vocable de Notre Dame dans les chapelles palatines des premiers Piasts en Pologne", *Mélanges offert à René Crozet* I, 1966, pp. 159-167.
4. Gervers-Molnár, V. *A középkori Magyarország rotundái* (Rotundas of medieval Hungary), with English summary, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1972, pp. 26-30; Dercsényi, D., "Vorromanische Kirchentypen in Ungarn", *Acta Historiae Artium*, XX/1-2 (1974), pp. 6-8, fig. 11.

5. Cibulka, J., "Le chiese della Grande Moravia", *Sancti Cyrillus e Methodius, Vita e Opera*, Prague, 1963, pp. 86ff; Kořán (1966), pp. 1057-66; Kotrba, V., "Cirkevní stavby Velké Moravy" (Churches of Great Moravia), *Umeni*, XII (1964), pp. 325ff; Merhautová (1966), pp. 111-117; Poulik, J., *Dvě velkomoravské rotundy v Mikulčicích* (Two Great Moravian rotundas at Mikulčice), in the series *Monumenta Archaeologia*, XII, Prague, 1963.
6. Deriving from a number of different sources, other types of round churches also appeared in these countries from at least the 11th century.

Book Reviews

The New Hungarian Agriculture. By Lewis A Fischer and Philip E. Uren. Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1973. 168 pp. \$10.00.

The *New Hungarian Agriculture* is a descriptive rather than an analytical work. The book follows the structural development of Hungarian agriculture and countryside since 1945, with some glances back to the prewar years.

The 120 pages are divided into seven chapters. The readers are reminded in several instances of periods in Hungarian history when foreign influences dominated the land. This was "not all bad," in the authors' view. The inequities of prewar land distribution and the redistribution of land in 1945 are well documented. "The great land reform" created too small units, and donated the land to many individuals ill-equipped with finances and often lacking the knowledge of how to cultivate and manage a farm. The inevitable failure to private farming ended in collectivization which had a short setback following Stalin's death but came to a conclusion in the 1960's when authorities applied "greater skill" to achieve their goal.

The authors selected 3 collective farms in Somogy county to illustrate the great varieties in stage and type of farming even in close vicinity. These differences are hidden in aggregate national statistics.

The authors explain the New Economic Mechanism which has been in effect since 1968. This mechanism is a deviation from the Communist economic theory. It involves limited use of market economy and reintroduces the profit motive. Under this mechanism, auxiliary industrial activities have been permitted in collectives and the continuation of household farming has been assured and even supported.

Industrial development in absorbing farm workers gradually relieved the agricultural sector from overemployment; however, because many of the younger people left the farms, this exodus led to the ageing of farm population. At present, a gradual amalgamation of neighboring collectives is in process. This consolidation of farming may help prove a new type of village development, a center with

about 5,000 population serving as nucleus to the smaller settlements. These villages will have hospitals, and educational and cultural facilities.

The principal merit of the book lies in its good organization. The authors bring under one roof the materials available on economic, topographical, and rural development and they point out the interdependence of various factors, including political, which are shaping rural life in Hungary.

This reviewer considers a shortcoming the book's numerous citations, footnotes, and tables which are of little value to the lay reader. If the authors are writing for the serious student of social and economic aspects of socialized agriculture, the presented data are inadequate. To this reviewer's disappointment, the author's field trips to Hungary revealed no more information than what has been available in the literature. The authors sounded out only county officials, writers and leaders of the present regime, and retold the official version. It remains obscure what one of the authors gained in discussing the "black Christmas in 1944 and the days of Hunyadi," with young farm managers who were in 1944 at grade school age.

The authors' thesis in connecting the "great land reform" with the previous inequalities in land distribution and relating the collectivization with the failure of productivity on the newly created units is erroneous. The land reform was an intermediary step designed to justify collectivization by its anticipated failures. The land reform was conducted in a disruptive manner—not for correcting past inequalities but for destroying the so-called class enemies. A few statements in the book, with little validity, could have been avoided like "the Westerners were unreasonable to regard Stalin's iron rule total and permanent." This reviewer has not met a "Westerner" yet, who did not expect some change for the better after Stalin's death. The authors' statement in Chapter IV that, "collectivization is sine qua non of any socialist system," raises a question about their familiarity of the agricultural organizations in Sweden, Finland, Yugoslavia, or Poland. Nevertheless, the book's merits outweigh the few shortcomings, one of which is the lack of providing insight into the daily life of farm workers and collective members. The book mainly concerns itself with the framework surrounding the farmers, not with the farmers themselves. The book has not made clear to me whether everybody engaged in farming or just a minority is standing at the threshold of the "brave new world" the authors see coming.

United States Department of Agriculture

Thomas A. Vankai

A Study in Austrian Romanticism: Hungarian Influences in Lenau's Poetry. By Agnes Huszar Vardy, with an historical introduction on the Age of Romanticism by Steven Bela Vardy. State University of New York College at Buffalo Program in East European and Slavic Studies, No. 6. Buffalo: Hungarian Cultural Foundation, 1974. 173 pages. \$6.00.

Austrian Literature has seldom been accorded a life of its own, yet whoever studies it soon learns that it is distinct from German: in spite of identity of language, Austrian literature has its own being. A good example of this is to be found in Nicholas Lenau, one of the chief lyric poets of German *Weltschmerz*. In her study of this representative of Austrian Romanticism, Agnes Huszar Vardy concentrates on one of the factors that distinguish the literature of this country from those of other German-speaking states: the input of the nationalities which formed the Austrian empire. One of these, Hungarian, had a cultural heritage essentially independent of the Austrian, though the cultural exchange between Hungary and its German-speaking neighbor had always been significant. In Lenau's time it entered a unique phase. On the one hand, German-speaking Hungarians became interested in the language and traditions of the Magyars, while on the other, repeal of repressive legislation allowed the teaching of Hungarian in the schools of the country. To this was added the flurry of activity that accompanied the linguistic, literary and political interests of the Reform Age, and it is clear that few poets could have remained unaffected. Lenau certainly did not.

In her study of Lenau, Professor Vardy presents the various influences that Hungary exerted on the poet between his birth in 1802 and the time when, owing to pressure from his wealthy grandfather, he settled permanently outside of Hungary. It is important to note that these were the years of Reform, and the spirit of the times, as Steven B. Vardy points out in his introduction, enabled Lenau to learn more of the rural, non-German conditions than his Germanic and primarily urban background would suggest. This awakening of interest in their Magyar homeland by German settlers accounts for part of Lenau's Hungarian heritage. Agnes Vardy, however, concentrates on the more definitive Hungarian influences in the poet's childhood and youth.

The poet's father, an officer in the Habsburg bureaucracy, died young, so that Nicholas was brought up by his mother, the daughter of patrician burghers of Pest. The family's traditions, consequently, had been tied to Hungary in spite of their retaining a basically German culture. The poet's education reflected this: instruction in Hungarian at the provincial town of Tokaj after the mother's remarriage, studies at the notoriously pro-Hungarian Piarist gymnasium in Pest, and

lessons from the tutor József Kövesdy. Professor Vardy effectively proves that in poems such as "Die Bauern am Tissastrande," "Die drei Zigeuner" or the Mischka poems, Lenau is drawing on the remembrances of his youth. "Lenau's subjective description and use of Hungarian imagery," she argues, "while stemming from immediate experience, reveal intense emotions which show more understanding of the Magyar frame of mind, customs and traditions than that of his fellow Austrian and German poets."

Several areas of "typically" Hungarian life are considered: gypsy music, pictures of hussars, *betyárs* and gypsies. Extensive quotations from the poems (these are given in full in the appendix) and selections from the poet's letters give proof of Lenau's obvious attachment to the scenes of his youth. The point is indubitable, yet well argued. However, one would wish for greater depth in the analysis of the poems. The author tends to rely heavily on paraphrase and summary; though the observations on the poems are generally valid, one always feels that she draws back from the poem upon stating its particular Hungarian implications.

A near exception to the above generalization is found in the comment on the "Schilflieder," in which Agnes Vardy argues that the imagery of the reeds reflects the poet's psychology. In mentioning the role of music in the formation of Lenau's Hungarian and poetic heritage, she is again perceptive. Unfortunately, such probing is abandoned too soon, and instead we have commentary with little commitment: in discussing "Die Werbung" she notes that the system of recruiting soldiers by means of a dance was fairly common in Eastern Europe in the early 19th century, yet fails to explain that the name of the dance, "verbunkos," is a characteristically Hungarian distortion of the German "Werbung." Such clues to cultural exchanges should not be ignored. Similarly, in discussing the cultural revival of the 1820's, she fails to stress that, though *some* of the Austrian and German-speaking nationals living in Hungary tended to consider Hungarian traditions as part of the overall Austrian "Volksgut," a significant majority never did so: Hormayr and his colleagues prepared the way for a renewal of Hungarian, not Germanic culture. Such superficial statements seem to point to both a fear of being challenged and a reluctance to probe the sources deeply. They are consistent with what this reviewer feels was Agnes Vardy's failure to get to the "meat" of the poems.

The information given through the use of Lenau's letters and the interpretation of the poems give the reader a new perspective on both Lenau and Austrian Romanticism. Professor Vardy introduces the poet as a charming, gifted and tragic person. The numerous pictures included in the work, illustrating both Hungary and Lenau's life, provide an added dimension.

A disturbing aspect of the mechanics of this volume is the handling of the German material. Translations of the poems are given as part of the text, enclosed in parentheses. I believe such prose English versions should have a less prominent place—as footnotes or in the appendix. The reader who is unfamiliar with German could then consult the English, while others would not be annoyed by interpolations. Similarly, both the introductory essay and the main work abound in bracketed translations of obvious terms: Weltschmerz [world grief], Vormärz [pre-March]. Thankfully, these are relatively more restrained in the body of the work.

The introductory essay is useful for the background it gives on Austro-Hungarian relations in the early 19th century, but the style is choppy; it has a tendency towards the use of clichés and awkward, fragmented sentences. The style of the book itself is more lively and interesting, even when the dissertation flavor remains. This is particularly evident in prompting the author to explain rather than explicate the poetry of Lenau. One is especially disappointed after the “Preface” suggested in-depth research in Vienna and Budapest, which the book does not bear out.

The American University

Enikő Molnár Basa

Review of Reviews

(Abstracts)

Jewish Nobles and Geniuses in Modern Hungary. By William O. McCagg, Jr. East European Monographs III. Distributed by Columbia University Press, New York, 1972. 245 pp.

The strange title of this book does not do justice to a most remarkable work. It offers in the first place a case study of the evolution of a financial-industrial and intellectual elite which in the course of little more than two generations achieved spectacular success and yet failed by this very achievement to shed its minority character in Hungarian public life. In demonstrating this process Professor McCagg traces characteristic features of social development in Hungary between 1848 and 1918 which set conditions there aside from those in other Habsburg lands. Yet the author offers even more, namely patterns of social developments of specific groups in transition from a predominantly agrarian to a capitalistic economic structure. The book offers indeed as much to the student in the field of East Central European social history as to the sociologist.

Basically the author perceives three main causes in the evolution of Jewish co-dominance in the capitalistic structure and leadership in intellectual activities of Hungarian society: a social issue embedded in changes in 19th century social structure; a psychological issue reflected in the urge of a minority to become more like the majority and in doing so over-reaching itself; and finally a political one. This last factor means that in the deep constitutional crisis in Hungary from 1903 to 1906 the forces of old with the support of the king-emperor gained the upper hand. The hope for a restructuring of Hungarian society in terms of greater social justice and a fair compromise with the suppressed national groups went by the board. This failure frustrated and disillusioned the particularly gifted young people who were to a substantial part of Jewish extraction. Many of them moved from participation in the narrow ruts of Hungarian social life to a wider one in the fields of internationally recognized natural sciences. The Kármán, Wigner, Teller, Szillard, von Neumann and their like shifted, in part even without specific intention, from the objective of social reform at home to hoped-for contributions to the liberal world of the West. Natural sciences were the main currency in which the fees

for migration were to be paid, and the social sciences and humanities, exemplified by the achievements of men like Jászi, Lukacs, K. Mannheim, often followed the same track

One does not have to agree with all of McCragg's propositions; in particular one might perceive some as stronger than others. The psychological factor, for instance, may be rated somewhat higher and the political one lower than the author sees them

Simply by the wealth of new material presented, by the originality of the topic and the brilliance of the author's accomplishment I would rate this book higher than any other in the field of East Central European history that has come to my attention in several years.

Robert A. Kann (Rutgers University), *Canadian Journal of History*, Vol. IX, No. 2, (August 1974).

Guide to Hungarian Studies. By Elemer Bako. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1973. 2 vols. XV, 1218 pp.

This massive two-volume work is an important contribution to bibliographical research on Hungary. It contains 4,426 entries, some annotated, culled from a wide range of sources

The bibliography is divided into twenty chapters covering such diverse fields as statistical research, geography, demography, history and historiography, constitution and legislation, government and politics, social life and institutions, economics, religion and church affairs, Hungarian language and literature, fine arts, education, scientific research, and press and publishing. The chapter entitled "General Works" includes general bibliographies, catalogues, lists, encyclopedias, reference guides, and dictionaries.

In spite of its seemingly well-organized format, however, this bibliography is an obstacle course for the researcher. One problem is that Mr. Bako distinguishes only four categories within each chapter: "Special Reference Works," "Journals and Monographic Series," "Monographs," and "Articles and Minor Publications." Within these categories the arrangement is strictly alphabetical. As a result, the researcher interested in a specific period or topic must scan every entry in the chapter.

Another problem is that the distinctions supposedly made by the chapter headings are themselves blurred. For example, a bibliography of the 1956 Hungarian revolution by I. Halász de Béky is included in the chapter on history while an article entitled "The Literature of the

Hungarian Revolution: A Bibliographical Survey" written by G. Vissi is listed in the chapter on government and politics.

The confusion created by overlapping categories is further aggravated by the existence of a chapter on Hungarians abroad. Such a category is certainly justified . . . But "Hungarians Abroad" is not what one expects. In an unfortunate move, Mr. Bako decided to list under this heading not only materials related to Hungarian emigres but also all historical works pertaining to those territories which Hungary lost after World War I. For instance, one finds such entries as Transylvania's relations with England from 1526 to 1711; Hungary's intellectual contacts with the Southern Slavs, beginning with the Middle Ages; the history of the stage arts in Arad between 1774 and 1889; and the history of the teachers' lyceum in Kassa, 1747-1904 . . .

This bibliography is selective. Mr. Bako's aim was to be representative rather than exhaustive . . . Moreover, it includes only those studies which appeared before 1965. Hence this volume provides merely an introduction to the vast material on Hungary and does not replace other bibliographies in the field.

Despite its flaws, Mr. Bako's *Guide to Hungarian Studies* is a much-needed reference work. It is an important publication which every library should have.

Eva S. Balogh (Yale University), *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, Vol. XVII, No. 1, (Spring 1975).

Parteien und Reichstagswahlen in Ungarn 1848-1892. By Adalbert Toth. Munchen: R. Oldenburg Verlag, 1973.

In Hungary, centuries-long domination by Austria precluded a meaningful participation in national and international affairs. Yet this dependence co-existed with a stubborn perseverance of provincial autonomy in which legalistic hairsplitting and highly personalized and passionate politicking made up for the lack of decision-making opportunities on the national and foreign policy levels. The 1867 Compromise—equal partnership with Austria—did not radically alter that mentality; on the contrary, the constitutional issue of whether to tighten or loosen ties with Austria perpetuated and deepened the national proclivity for endless legalistic arguments and further inflamed political passions, which were still highly personal and frequently parochial. The well-known saying that "politics is the art of the possible" reflects the kind of down-to-earth and pragmatic approach to politics, characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon world. Politics in post-1848 Hungary, on the other hand, had retained much of the

emotional content of past history, continuing to be the art of the desirable rather than the art of the possible.

Such a framework does not easily lend itself to a systematic and rigorous classification. The merit of Dr. Adalbert Toth's work lies precisely in the author's successful attempt to apply such a treatment to the fluid and often confusing picture of Hungarian party politics and elections from 1848 to 1892

All in all, his book is a product of remarkable scholarship, a pioneering study which will undoubtedly become an indispensable reference work for anyone interested in that period of Hungarian history. Appropriately, this review should be concluded with the wish that Dr. Toth will continue his research and writing in this field and carry the story of Hungarian political parties and elections beyond 1892.

Gabor Vermes (Rutgers University, Newark), *East European Quarterly*, Vol. IX, No. 2 (Summer 1975).

Hungary: A Century of Economic Development. By I.T. Berend and G. Ranki. David and Charles, Ltd., Great Britain, 1974. Pp. 263.

The process of Hungarian economic development as Professors Berend and Ranki relate has been the slow metamorphosis of the country from a predominantly agricultural society to one in which industry has the foremost position. The authors conclude the industrialization of the country has been the logical outcome of an inevitable process, periodically marked by state intervention which culminated in the socialist transformation of Hungary. However, more realistically the economic development that did occur in Hungary should be viewed as the role to which the economy was assigned as the country aligned with different major powers. First as part of the Hapsburg Empire, then its gradual absorption into the German sphere of influence and finally its position in the Soviet dominated CMEA

The foundations for the industrialization of the country centers around the years of the *Ausgleich*. At this time foreign banks and financial groups invested heavily in Hungary providing the necessary capital accumulation for an economic "take-off". At the same time the state supported industrialization through the state owned railroads and related heavy industry

The dominant feature of the Hungarian economy has been its seriously one-sided character. Initially it was an agricultural society and when industrialization began, the emphasis was on heavy

industry rather than light industry. This imbalance was reflected in the fact that Hungary exported raw agricultural products and imported finished goods for internal consumption. By the end of the Hapsburg period the Hungarian economy had undergone substantial changes, but was not basically transformed, as many static relationships continued to persist. There remained the inherent weakness of the economy and its dependency on exporting agricultural goods. This was further aggravated at the end of World War I when Hungary, as a result of the territorial losses separated her industries from their sources of raw materials.

During the post-war decade state intervention created the potential for a broadening of the domestic market and general economic expansion. Simultaneously, the commitment of the western countries to further prevent the penetration of socialism into Eastern Europe led them to extend financial credits to Hungary. This assistance, accepted at high rates of interest and poorly used, created the necessity of drafting additional loans resulting once more in the dependency of the country on foreign credits and powerless in terms of western economic penetration. The depression and collapse of the creditor nations brought about the economic alignment of Hungary and Germany

In the inter-war period there remained no solution to the major social issue, that of land reform. Some modernization of agriculture had taken place but this was primarily on the large estates and never reached the small peasant holding which still remained a dominant force in agriculture

The emergence of a war economy in the later part of the thirties greatly improved the economic situation of the country but in actual fact, this was unrealistic for such a falsely inflated economic structure could not continue indefinitely. Due to Germany's mounting indebtedness economic conditions worsened and the final months of the war were disastrous. The authors estimate that forty percent of the nation's wealth was lost directly from the transporting of industrial and agricultural goods to Germany and damage from the war. Professors Berend and Ranki argue that the losses to Germany and severe war damage resulted in an economic collapse of the country but neglect to mention the tremendous war preparations that were exacted by the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and other countries.

As a result of the successful socialist revolution, the Hungarian economy became modeled on that of the Soviet Union. The introduction of planned measures resulted not in the spectacular economic growth that was envisioned but did bring about a general improvement in the overall economic situation. Utilizing antiquated methods, and greatly expanded labor force caused by the mechanization of agri-

culture, high industrial output was achieved. Quality was inferior and the goods were not competitive with those produced in the West or the more industrially advanced socialist countries. By the 1960's Hungarian exports had changed from agricultural to finished industrial goods and trade was carried on primarily with other socialist countries according to planned measures. Exports to the West consisted of agricultural products for the most part.

The authors disregard the relationship of the Soviet Union in the Hungarian economy and CMEA which dominates the inter-socialist export trade. They offer no justifications for the changes in agricultural policies since World War II and the fact that the producers' co-operatives have been the least successful aspect of the Hungarian economy. Hungary, once the breadbasket for empires, is now in the position of having to import agricultural goods . . .

James V. Fitzgerald, Jr. (University of Colorado), *East European Quarterly*, Vol. IX, No. 2 (Summer 1975).

The Pattern of Reform in Hungary: A Political, Economic and Cultural Analysis. By William F. Robinson. New York, Washington and London: Praeger Publishers, 1973. Pp. 468.

As its title implies, Robinson's work is not history in the ordinary sense but an examination of Hungary's fluctuating trends of economic, political, social, and cultural reform during the past two decades. The author, a political scientist and a senior analyst for Radio Free Europe, has attempted to trace the antecedents of reform, depict its character, and assess its ramifications within the framework of Marxist authoritarianism and the West's technological revolution. The interplay between the two hostile systems constitutes the leitmotif for Robinson's investigation.

The book deals with a great variety of crucial issues arising from Hungary's quest for a *détante* both with domestic and foreign detractors. Among other things, Hungary's Communist regime had to reconcile Marxist dogma with the realities of life in the West which, contrary to somber predictions had grown extremely productive and prosperous. Until recently, the Marxist had dismissed the computerized technological revolution—the source of all this affluence—as a decadent bourgeois phenomenon. More recently, however as Robinson recounts, spectacular advancements in all walks of life in the capitalist countries had greatly impressed the Hungarians. They suddenly became enthusiastic champions of the scientific revolution they had formerly despised . . .

Despite certain shortcomings Robinson's book is a welcome addition to the current literary harvest on East European Marxist problems. Unfortunately, the author is not always objective. At times he criticizes Party policies on the basis of personal bias, at other times—and this is when he is at his best—Robinson is a dispassionate observer. For references the author has regrettably chosen predominantly non-scholarly Hungarian sources and Radio Free Europe staff reports. Robinson would have been well advised to consult other sources as well, as to commit his final draft to scholarly scrutiny. Still, the author's style is excellent, his organization lucid, his prose interesting and concise . . .

Thomas Spira (University of Prince Edward Island), *East European Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, No. 1 (March 1974).

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Barath, Tibor. *A külföldi magyarság ideológiája: Történetpolitikai tanulmányok*. Montreal, 1975. Published by the author.
- Szabó, Dezső. *Az egész látóhatár: Tanulmányok*. Lyndhurst, N.J.: Kalaka, 1975.
- Shawcross, William. *Crime & Compromise: Janos Kadar and the Politics of Hungary Since Revolution*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1974.
- Szeplaki, Joseph (editor and compiler). *The Hungarians in America, 1583-1974: A chronology & Fact Book*. Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, 1975.
- Wojatsek, Charles. *Hungarian: Textbook and Grammar*. Oakville, Ontario: The Sovereign Press, 1974. Third Revised Edition.
- Degh, Linda. *People in the Tobacco Belt: Four Lives*. Canadian Centre for Folk Culture Studies, Paper No. 13. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1975.
- Laping, Francis (compiler) and Hans Knight (editor). *Remember Hungary 1956*. Alpha Publications, 1975.
- Simontsits, Attila and Karoly Kovendy (compilers). *Harcunk. . . 1920-1945: A M. Kir. fegyveres erők képekben*. Toronto, 1975. Published by the compilers.

Articles published in the
Canadian-American Review of Hungarian Studies

VOLUME I

A Canadian Meets the Magyars—by Watson Kirkconnell

Franco-Rumanian Intervention in Russia and the *Vix Ultimatum*:
Background to Hungary's Loss of Transylvania—by Peter Pastor

Nikolaus Lenau and Germanic Literary Interest in Hungary during the
First Half of the Nineteenth Century by Agnes Huszar Vardy

Recent Publications in Hungarian Art History—by Alfonz Lengyel

VOLUME II

The State of Education in Hungary on the Eve of the Battle of Mohács
(1926)—by L.S. Domonkos

Travel Reports on Hungarian Settlements in Canada, 1905-1928—by
Paul Bódy

Count István Tisza and the Preservation of the Old Order—by Gabor
Vermes

Horthy, Hitler and the Hungary of 1944—by Peter Gosztony

Polanyi and the Treason of the Intellectuals—by Lee Congdon

Hungarian Studies at American and Canadian Universities—by
Steven Bela Vardy

Origins of Romanesque Rotundas in East-Central Europe—by
Veronika Gervers-Molnar

For back issues and offprints write to Dr. Ferenc Harcsar, 908-1356
Meadowlands Drive East, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K2E 6K6.

